The CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

CONTINUING

THE REVIEW OF HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA

(Founded at the University of Toronto in 1896)

VOL. XXXIII, No. 2, JUNE, 1952

CONTENTS

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Articles in the REVIEW are indexed in the *Canadian Index* and in the *International Index to Periodical Literature.*

Communications with regard to subscriptions and advertising should be addressed to The Manager, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.

AUTHORIZED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OTTAWA

THE COMING OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT TO NEW BRUNSWICK

By W. S. MacNutt

IT is customary to speak and write of the application of the British principle of Responsible Government to the colonies of North America in terms of tension and conflict. Canadian nationalists are at a singular disadvantage compared with those of other countries for, unlike the French, British, and Americans, they can not manufacture the true stuff of nationality from the memories of a popular uprising. But the "winning" of Responsible Government and the "victory" of the Reformers have almost become a part of the Canadian legend. The respectability and fame of the grandson of William Lyon Mackenzie have given clarity to this interpretation and added breath to those who would apologize for emancipation and autonomy. Yet historians who understand the state of public opinion in British North America at the time are aware that these are gross over-simplifications. For the pattern was not so clearly distinguishable. Certainly in one province, New Brunswick, Responsible Government "came" in spite of the doubts, fears, and even forthright opposition of those who held the confidence of the Legislature.

It is the purpose of this article to chronicle the important developments in the politics of the province from the arrival of Sir William Colebrooke as Lieutenant-Governor in 1841 until the time when Earl Grey's dispatch of 1847 had made its complete impact upon the forms of government of the province. Forms of government, it may safely be said, took very secondary place to the more practical problems of the colony throughout this period of ten years. Responsible Government had been debated in 1840 but it had been dismissed as having little bearing on fundamental affairs. The burning light of pure truth had been concealed beneath a bushel of more concrete realities. The thoroughly rational appeals which Lemuel Allen Wilmot and an uncertain handful in the House of Assembly had been making since the publication of the Durham *Report* had been extinguished amid the more businesslike proceedings of supply and appropriation.

Vol. XXXIII, no. 2, June, 1952

Practical problems were heavy and pressing when Sir William Colebrooke arrived. British preferential duties on colonial timber had been drastically reduced, and the effect upon Saint John and the Miramichi, whose shippers were as pessimistic in bad times as they were optimistic in good, was paralytic. Unemployment was general. A fire at Portland destroyed the homes of thousands of Saint John working people. Emigration to the United States commenced on a great scale and ships were chartered for Australia. When a second fire destroyed the newly erected exchange buildings and a great number of warehouses at Saint John, conditions akin to panic developed. It seemed for a time that there were no capital sources of wealth remaining by which the homeless could be sustained and by which labour could be employed. Holders of Saint John Corporation bonds commenced actions in the courts to seize its properties, building-lots, wharves, and mill-ponds. A complete shift in the New Brunswick economy seemed inevitable. Labourers and mechanics, convinced that the timber trade was finished, formed associations to remove to rural areas. Many rejoiced to think that a race of true yeomanry was finally in prospect for New Brunswick. But there were no means at hand to tide over the period of transition. "If the timber-trade goes the land will not support them." The province was in debt, its credit worthless. By the end of 1842 the amount of bank paper in circulation had dropped by two-thirds and the price of labour and commodities by one-third.[1]

There were opportunities for reformers, and Colebrooke, imbued with the sanguine faith of the English Whigs in beneficial legislation, could see solutions to the difficulties. "Sir William had been successful as Governor and Commissioner in the Leeward Islands and came to New Brunswick with the benevolent intention of emancipating the white slaves from their prejudices."[2] But he found himself with a government which had virtually no influence or resources, with a legislature which functioned without deference to guidance from the executive. In the House of Assembly there was a temper which looked for models not from the procedures of contemporary Westminster but from the committees which had baffled Charles I. Revenue was raised and supply was voted without reference to the officials of government.[3] The situation might be tense

[1]For a description of these conditions see P.A.C., C.O. 188/201, Colebrooke to Stanley, Nov. 27, 1841, March 29, 30, Sept. 27, 1842.

[2]*Conservative and Loyalist*, Saint John, Dec. 23, 1847.

[3]For a description of New Brunswick government at this time see another article by the same writer, "New Brunswick's Age of Harmony," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXII, June, 1951, 105–25.

and ideas might be big but the means of amelioration were in the hands of the gentlemen from the constituencies whose local purposes would be prejudiced by the outlay of large sums of money for provincial projects.

The programme of Colebrooke, which ignored the abstract theory of the Durham *Report* but derived much practical suggestion from that contentious document, was an attack upon the basic institutions of the province which far overshadowed in these years the fulminations of Wilmot and his associates. It was directed towards efficiency rather than responsibility and appeared far more menacing to the vested interests of the political groups which ruled. First, the Assembly must be persuaded to surrender the initiative of money votes to the executive, a suggestion which was warmly applauded by Stanley who agreed that the existing system wasted the public resources of the province "by commissions selected in an improper manner and from questionable motives."[4] Intimately associated with this was the request to the British Government for a loan by which the credit of the province could be restored and a programme of public works inaugurated. The politicians of the Canadas had seen reason in the surrender of the initiative with the prospect of a loan from London before them. This feature of the Canada Act might be applied to New Brunswick. The establishment of municipal corporations, just commenced by Sydenham in Canada and favoured by so many reforming spirits in Britain, would reduce the extraordinary amount of parish-pump transactions in the Legislature and force politicians to adopt a more provincial and less local bias. And true and lasting progress could be achieved in New Brunswick only by altering the conditions of land-grants. Villages must arise in which, for mutual aid and example, settlers must be more closely clustered together. Too much land had been granted to the individual settler and "the negligent husbandry of isolated farms" had prevailed. The seriousness of the situation was emphasized by contrast with the progressive townships of Maine, which, profiting from government planning and communal organization, had pushed their way northward and eastward to the New Brunswick border.

All things may have been wrong but even the reforming zeal and progressive spirit of Sir William Colebrooke could not right them. The bills which at his instigation were introduced to the Legislature were all defeated. The attempt to set aside the system of appropriation in favour of the executive was defeated by a substantial majority in the House of Assembly. The method tested by

[4]P.A.C., C.O. 188/170, Stanley to Colebrooke, Aug. 11, 1842.

fifty years of experience could suffer no alterations.[5] The lower house passed the bill to establish municipal corporations, modelled on Sydenham's legislation in Canada, by the casting vote of the Speaker, but the Legislative Council, the citadel of the old system, threw it out. In pressing these proposals in the Legislature Colebrooke and his few supporters, notably Charles Simonds, employed the hope of a loan to be negotiated on the British money market. "It is the opinion of many experienced persons that under a financial system calculated to sustain the public credit the Province would be able to negotiate a loan on the English money market although on terms less favourable than with the guarantee of Her Majesty's government."[6] But no encouragement came from the Colonial Office.

Only at large discounts would the banks honour the provincial credit. Warrants issued upon the Treasurer were being hawked about by money-lenders. Regarding the circumstances as desperate, Colebrooke refused to sign the large number of orders authorized by the Legislature for expenditure upon the bye roads in 1842. Mathematically his case was an excellent one. Revenue would not meet expenditure. But the refusal was regarded by the assemblymen as a savage reprisal for their non-compliance with his views and adversely prejudiced the Lieutenant-Governor in the public mind throughout the remainder of his administration. In the autumn of that year there was a great deal of distress throughout the rural areas owing to the absence of the familiar employment upon the bye roads.[7]

Almost completely defeated, Colebrooke resorted to dissolution. In the election which took place early in 1843 and which was fought chiefly on the issues which he had raised, virtually everybody was against him. The greatest evidence of public disapprobation had been the resignation of the Chief Justice, Ward Chipman, from the presidency of the Legislative Council upon the question of the surrender of the initiative and more particularly upon the right of the Legislative Council to scrutinize each item upon the appropriations lists. The people's liberties must be guarded against executive invasion. Municipal incorporation would be the harbinger of the taxgatherer. John R. Partelow, the most influential member of the Assembly, was "against any change" in the constitution, and Robert F. Hazen, the young barrister of Saint John whose eminence, even at the beginning of his political career, all took for granted, was

[5]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, Feb. 9, 1842.

[6]P.A.C., C.O. 188/202, Colebrooke to Stanley, May 14, 1842.

[7]P.A.C., Council Minutes, July 4, 1843, with enclosure from William Hallett, J.P. of Perth.

scarcely less emphatic. This election of 1843, fought amid January storms, was probably the classic of New Brunswick elections during the colonial period. Fixed bayonets at Fredericton, great scenes of mob enthusiasm at Saint John, beatings and destruction of property on the Miramichi were added to the multitude of organized demonstrations, bonfires, and illuminations which gilded the winter scene.[8] When it was over there was no doubt that enlightenment of any variety whatsoever was not wanted. Two sets of reforming ideas, Colebrooke's and the less businesslike theories of Lemuel Allen Wilmot, had been presented to the New Brunswick public. In the new Assembly neither would be able to muster a corporal's guard. If any principle had triumphed it was that of the undesirability of change.

When the Legislature of 1843 met, the challenge to Colebrooke was immediate. The election of a speaker was made a question of principle and, amid general plaudits not unmixed with emotion, Partelow nominated John Wesley Weldon of Kent, who had just resigned from Colebrooke's Government, as one "possessing conservative principles and a thorough knowledge of the constitution."[9] The predominant temper was to resist any intrusion upon the historic privileges of the House; and as the session continued there was no attempt to curtail expenditure. Attacks commenced upon the privileges of office-holders who were protected by the Civil List Act of 1837. Colebrooke saw that to retain any influence at all he must remodel the Executive Council. "A change was necessary or another session would have been lost."[10]

The new Government which Colebrooke selected at this stage formed the basis of "the compact" by which the province was governed for the next ten years. It was an assemblage of men which in the main represented the strain of heredity and continuity, of resistance to innovation. There were Hugh Johnston and Edward Barron Chandler of the Legislative Council. From the Assembly came Robert F. Hazen who could not understand Responsible Government and Lemuel Allen Wilmot, its foremost advocate. For the sake of harmony they could work in double harness. Alone of the Council that had served Sir John Harvey there remained Charles Simonds. He had supported the Lieutenant-Governor's programme and survived the complaints of the newcomers who at first objected to serve with him. They had been of different parties but Colebrooke

[8]For a vivid account of the disturbances on the Miramichi see Esther Clark Wright, *The Miramichi* (Sackville, N.B., 1944).

[9]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, Jan. 31, 1843.

[10]P.A.C., C.O. 188/171, Colebrooke to Stanley, March 25, 1843.

had been determined to avoid a "single party government." They all made sacrifices but "did not permit their party predilections to gain the ascendancy." If there was a leader it was the shrewd and enterprising but cold and unemotional Edward Barron Chandler whose "boundless influence" had made of Dorchester Corners the political centre of southwestern New Brunswick. Because of differences it was not a government capable of new measures but it possessed the great virtue of being able to control the Assembly. "In all these arrangements I have been guided solely by the consideration of the paramount importance of regaining the influence of the Government in the affairs of the Province in failure of which it would have been impossible to carry on the Public Services or indeed to sustain the Royal Prerogative without coming into direct collision with the Assembly, an issue on every account to be deprecated."[11]

It was a group of men whom Colebrooke himself designated "the compact party." Family ties were sufficiently numerous to justify the use of the expression "family compact" which, having been imported from Canada, was coming into general parlance in New Brunswick. Hazen was the nephew of Chief Justice Chipman who was himself the centre of a vast web of office-holding relations. And the interests of office-holders gradually became integrated with those of members of this new Government. Because of the many lawyers who were members it was given a professional character, and there were to be frequent appeals from electoral platforms against the great influence of the New Brunswick Bar, which had become another instrument of privilege. But whatever may be said about "the compact party" it cannot be forgotten that its ascendancy rested upon control of the Legislature. And Partelow, the most influential member, though no child of fortune himself, was one of the most important elements in "the system." Indeed it might be no exaggeration to say that he was veritably the keystone of the arch. For the supremacy of the Legislature was still the established fact.

Complacency, then, became the *ton*. The Lieutenant-Governor's attempt to subvert the established system of government had been successfully resisted. Late in 1843 the timber trade revived and the political fleshpots became deeper. The Legislative Council was enlarged and democratized in a manner highly satisfactory to the Assembly.[12] Definitions of principle were rare. But the expression of

[11]*Ibid.*

[12]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, April 10, 1843; P.A.C., C.O. 188/171, Stanley to Colebrooke, July 11, 1843.

support to Sir Charles Metcalfe during his contest with his constitutional advisers could be taken as meaning that in New Brunswick there was no sympathy for those who would have the prerogative a plaything in the hands of political groups in the Assembly.[13] The only element which imperilled the unity of the Government and the stability of the system was the presence within it of Lemuel Allen Wilmot. He was a zealous participant in the system but his principles were at variance with it. His heresy was Responsible Government and circumstances favourable to that heresy were eventually to appear.

On Christmas Day, 1844, there occurred the death of William F. Odell, the Provincial Secretary, who had inherited the office from his father in 1812. The removal of the holder of one of the most valuable of public offices opened at once a question of principle. And on the same day Wilmot called upon the Lieutenant-Governor and informed him that unless the office were filled by a member of the Assembly, holding a seat in the Council, he would withdraw from the Government and agitate for the accomplishment of his views. Colebrooke would give him no satisfaction, citing the Royal Instructions and the circular dispatch of Lord John Russell, the purpose of which, he said, was to make officials dependent upon the Government rather than upon the Assembly "and to withdraw them from those influences by which the Government was weakened and its administration embarrassed." Other interviews followed and Colebrooke's defiance of those who favoured "the Canada system" was brashly illuminated by the appointment to the vacant office of his son-in-law, Alfred Reade. Justification for this act was the necessity of keeping the Lieutenant-Governor's correspondence free from the interference of those contaminated with "party bias." The reason was not so frivolous as might be supposed. It raised an issue which was to be of primary importance during the régimes of two successive lieutenant-governors.

The Executive Council evenly divided upon Reade's appointment. Wilmot resigned for the reason already given. Hazen, Johnston, and Chandler resigned, not because they favoured Wilmot's views, but because of embarrassment which the threatened agitation would occasion in the Assembly. "They were undoubtedly influenced by the family compact party with whom they are connected." They represented, said Colebrooke, "a class of trading politicians who are not

[13]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, Feb. 22, 1844.

counteracted by the influence of a class of country gentlemen."[14] In spite of the loss of the four more influential members, the four less influential remained. Simonds, Cunard, Saunders, and Montgomery supported the appointment.

The contest shifted to the Assembly on February 13 and Wilmot, seeing that he could not secure a majority in favour of his constitutional views, joined with the other dissident ex-Councillors on the score of personal objection to the appointment. The resolution that the appointment was unconstitutional was defeated by eighteen to fifteen. A second, that the appointment was "an act of great injustice to many individuals resident in this colony," was carried by nineteen to thirteen. There was bold language in the House which the Speaker was inclined to tolerate and against which Simonds, the master radical of 1837, was to remonstrate. A week later Partelow's motion, "that the Executive Council do not possess the confidence of the House nor of the country at large," passed by a majority of twenty-three to ten.[15]

What had happened was the coalescence of all the groups who were opposed to Colebrooke on any count whatever. But, undeterred by majorities, the Lieutenant-Governor recruited two inconspicuous members of the House of Assembly to the Government, which, though admittedly a minority administration, was firmly knit in the resolution to sustain the prerogative. He could sense the emergence of a lush conspiracy among the men who were opposed to him, a dire determination to reduce the Crown to a nominal consequence that amounted to degradation. The head and centre of it was Partelow who had led the legislative uprising, whose spider-like connections bound together the wavering, uncertain opinions and diverse material interests of New Brunswick politicians into a united front. As Colebrooke surmised, they "did not dare refuse supply." But at the end of the session he could unequivocally state that the central issue was a consideration of Responsible Government "as recognized in Canada." The majority of the House had rejected Wilmot's doctrine in the abstract. But the more men contemplated it the more they saw that it could conveniently be put to use in this present emergency. Thinking had been stimulated and the tempo quickened.

Had the Reade appointment not been negatived by the Colonial Secretary these sharp lines of conflict would have been sustained

[14]Colebrooke's own accounts of the interviews with members of the Council are most complete and recapitulary. They are to be found in P.A.C., C.O. 188/203, Colebrooke to Stanley, Feb. 25, 27, March 26, April 26, 27, May 12, 29, 1845.

[15]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, Feb. 20, 1845.

and the complexity of New Brunswick politics in the next few years would have given place to a single issue which transcended all others. But the result is well known. "The King of Smoothery was checkmated by the servant of the Queen. The emancipator, the inventor, the philanthropist, the dictator, the purger of the Legislative Council, sank at once into insignificance."[16] Stanley's dispatch of March 31 referred to the instructions to Sir Francis Head of March, 1835, that public employment was to be bestowed upon native or settled inhabitants of the province, which had been cited for the administrators of other colonies at the time. Reade's appointment was not approved.[17]

The humiliation was deep. In obedience to Stanley's exhortation to restore the Government to a popular basis Colebrooke was obliged to open invitations to Chandler, Johnston, and Hazen. Wilmot's views were so advanced that his case was obviously beyond the pale. On May 8 the three came to Fredericton to discuss their return to the Government with the Lieutenant-Governor. But that evening they dined with Partelow whose simultaneous reappearance at this time was regarded by Colebrooke as full of sinister implications. The next day they expressed desires for "the Canadian system" and a reluctance to serve with the four members of the Council who had supported Colebrooke throughout the crisis. There was fear of "instability" in the Assembly. Though they wanted "the Canadian system" they did not want a party government. No reconciliation at this stage could be accomplished.[18]

Until the legislative session of 1846 Colebrooke continued to govern with his residue of an Executive Council. The appointment of John Simcoe Saunders as Secretary on a non-permanent basis left the fundamental question unanswered. But at the first meeting of the Council prior to the opening of the session the members resigned rather than face the storms which lay ahead. Only renewed overtures to the trinity which commanded legislative support, Chandler, Johnston, and Hazen, provided the appropriate answer to the difficulty of forming a new government. Their reappearance in executive capacities marked the finish of the tumult, a reversion to the complacency of 1844. The initiative would remain with the Assembly,

[16]*Saint John Loyalist*, Dec. 23, 1847.

[17]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, Feb. 5, 1846. Stanley's instructions to Colebrooke upon the Reade affair are not to be found in the colonial correspondence at the Public Archives. There were almost certainly private communications in addition to the public dispatch which, by Stanley's command, was supplied to the Legislature. This was done in spite of Colebrooke's protests.

[18]P.A.C., C.O. 188/203, Colebrooke to Stanley, May 12, 1845.

municipal incorporation would not be pressed, the abstractions of constitutional theory would be unnoticed. In the session of 1846 there was a businesslike tranquillity. The comfort that came to Colebrooke in his last years in New Brunswick had been attendant upon his humiliation and surrender. For him it was reconciliation to "a system of corruption." The conservative quality of the Government was reinforced by the additions of Charles Jeffrey Peters, the Attorney-General, and George Shore, the holder of many minor offices, two aged relics of the pre-1837 compact. Elections in the autumn strengthened the ascendancy of the Government in the Assembly where Hazen was its capable exponent.

But comfort was not really to Colebrooke's liking. The organic changes which had taken place in the government of the province since 1837 had made the influence of the Assembly decisive in almost everything. Ability to get money for local purposes "by which the people are saved from local rates" was the grand criterion by which public men were judged. How far must the lieutenant-governor go in accepting the advice of an executive council dependent upon the favour of so unstable a body? A new colonial secretary could give no pointed reply to the question but offered inspiration with the philosophy of progress. Reforms would come only when the public were given correct information. "The combinations in support of particular views" could be defeated only by education and enlightenment.[19]

Shocks from outside if not from inside were to modify the system if they were not to modify the men. The Whigs were again in power in Britain and a new era for British North America commenced when Lord Elgin presented himself at the opening of the Nova Scotia Legislature at Halifax on January 21, 1847. For a time there had been an expectation that he would visit Fredericton, and Colebrooke's intention was to present him with a united front of New Brunswick politicians who were agreed upon essentials. Hazen was The Trimmer in these attempted arrangements the chief feature of which was to be the inclusion of Wilmot in the Government. New Brunswick was to offer a refreshing contrast to "the distraction which was tearing Nova Scotia to pieces, arraying man against his fellow-man, family against family, party against party." There was, said Hazen, no real difference between the parties which should prevent all from sharing office. But Wilmot "would never serve his country at the expense of his principles," certainly not, at any rate, in 1847

[19]*Ibid.*, Colebrooke to Gladstone, April 28, 1846; C.O. 188/174, Gladstone to Colebrooke, June 26, 1846.

when, after so many years of stultification, the harvest seemed ripe for the cutting. "If there was only a shade of difference between the two parties, that amalgamation was certainly of late origin; for in 1842 the avowal of sentiments favourable to Responsible Government was coupled with Radicalism, Republicanism, and Rebellion; and it was said that the Rebellion in Canada owed its origin to Responsible Government."[20] He would enter the Government only accompanied by his colleagues, three of seven or four of nine. "Mr. Ritchie said that he had met the honourable member from St. John [Hazen] coming from the committee-room, and that he told him Wilmot could not name three. His reply was, give Wilmot the power and he could name the whole nine."[21]

In these weeks there crystallized the party system which, with many intervals of confusion and uncertainty, marked a permanent division of political opinion in New Brunswick. Wilmot's followers took the Liberal nomenclature. Those in the dominant majority could be described as Conservatives, though this simplification must be made with caution. "The names of Liberals and Conservatives might be adopted by those who liked them."[22] The gritty few who supported the tribune of Responsible Government were all self-made men, Charles Fisher of York, of uncouth manner but probably the coolest head and best brain of the lot, James Brown of Charlotte, the Forfarshire emigrant, easily the most solid and constant, David Hanington of Kent, the son of a London fishmonger, William J. Ritchie of Saint John, whose promising political career was later blighted by the early acceptance of a judgeship. They were levelling, anti-Anglican and mildly secular, confident of progress. Though Wilmot and Fisher were the sons of Loyalists it could be said that they were representative of the new New Brunswick which was no longer predominantly Loyalist, of the great mass of the emigrant population to whom patronage had been denied. Later, when they were in power, the views which they advocated and the legislation which they enacted could be considered typical of nineteenth-century democracy.[23] Passion as well as reason contributed to the upthrust:

> He said he felt strongly upon this subject, and so he did; he would now relate an anecdote that had fallen under his own observation. Some years since a gentleman living in the country and who had a family growing up around him,

[20]House of Assembly Debates, *New Brunswick Courier*, Feb. 20, 1847.
[21]*Ibid.*, Feb. 13, 20, 1847.
[22]*Ibid.*, Speech of Wilmot, Feb. 13, 1847.
[23]For intimate descriptions of two of these men see in the *Maritime Advocate and Busy East*, Sackville, N.B., Marion Wathen Fox, "The Thrilling Story of the Founding of Shediac," June, 1950, and Lillian M. Maxwell, "Hon. James Brown," Nov., 1950.

began to feel the great want of proper schools for the education of his children. After some consideration he resolved to move to Fredericton, where his children could receive the advantages of a proper education—He done so [*sic*]—his children went to school and he embarked heavily in commercial pursuits. His eldest son having finished his education, was entered as a student at Law; and the day that saw that son admitted a Member of the Bar saw his father stripped of all his earthly possessions. That man (said Mr. W.) was my father! and that son he who now addresses you! Can it then be wondered at if he felt deeply in this matter. (The Hon. gentleman sat down, evidently much excited.)[24]

But these displays of rhetoric and strivings for high purpose were mingled with more immediate quarrels. Just as the truly British system of government seemed about to be inaugurated, even before the reformers witnessed the consumation of their ambitions, the united front for Responsible Government broke down. As the implications of the new system became real the question which became most prominent was this: If the holding of public office is to depend upon a simple vote of the House of Assembly, is there not only one place in the province where a sufficient number of gentlemen could be induced to serve on such brief tenure? That place, "one of the greatest cities of North America," was Saint John. As the session of 1847 closed the proposed "restoration" of the seat of government to that city destroyed the unity of the new Liberal party. Ritchie gave notice of motion to move the capital in 1848. Wilmot gave notice of an amendment.[25] "Now without the slightest desire to cast imputations upon the inhabitants of the present Seat of Government, all must feel there is not sufficient *material* there, satisfactorily to conduct the affairs of the State—no public opinion to correct and give energies to the proceedings of the Legislature; on the contrary that there is a lethargy, a want of life, vigour and intelligence which has singularly influenced our Provincial Legislature and Executive Government."[26] This threat to the privilege of Fredericton did not prove effective. Next year, in humour of triviality, the Assembly defeated Ritchie's motion, much to the indignation of the press and public of Saint John, as if that emporium of the future were of no account whatever.[27]

Responsible Government was just ahead but the disciplinary implications of a party system necessary to make it work in a tolerable manner were wanting. Small wonder that Wilmot later deserted his

[24]*New Brunswick Courier*, Debate upon Parish Schools, March 20, 1847, speech by Wilmot.

[25]New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, April 13, 1847.

[26]*Courier*, Jan. 1, 1848, "Future Prospects of the Province."

[27]*Ibid.*, March 25, 1848; New Brunswick, *Assembly Journals*, March 18, 20, 1848.

colleagues to enter a government which his opponents dominated! The year 1848 found him working with the Conservatives of York to keep the capital in Fredericton. There were new considerations, too, in 1848. The issue of Protection *versus* Free Trade contributed to demolish any semblance of real unity among the Reformers.[28]

In this year of new portents the Legislature of New Brunswick had assembled in *blasé* humour. Earl Grey's dispatch to Sir John Harvey had for months been known to the public of the province. Elsewhere it had been hailed as a charter of new liberties. The principles of Howe and Baldwin had triumphed in Westminster if not in Fredericton so where was the wisdom in resistance? Wilmot cockily played schoolmaster to the House. When he was appointed to a committee to draft the Address in Reply he refused to serve for in Britain it was the duty of members of the Government. The Legislature, he said, must learn the "new, old way" though there were protests that the "good, old way" was best.[29] When Partelow moved for a committee of the House to investigate the workings of the postal system he retorted that the Government should take responsibility.[30] But the great issue, that of Responsible Departmental Government, was poignantly accelerated by the death of Attorney-General Peters on February 3. Grey's dispatch was starkly relevant. What was the basis on which public office should be held? "The gentlemen who had a claim on the office" agreed that it should not be filled at this time. Colebrooke was about to leave New Brunswick. He was no fit instrument to inaugurate the new system.

On February 24 the House deliberated to approve or disapprove the principles elaborated in Grey's historic dispatch. Hazen, whose wavering course had been indicative of predominant trends of opinion for two years, said that he was willing to try them. Nobody of rank in the Assembly, in Government or Opposition, voted against the resolution of approval. It was a blithe affair and only a die-hard group of eleven "country" members voted against it, to provoke merriment rather than serious concern. "The sleep of years," said the *Courier*, "is about to be broken. In fact reason seems to emerge from the cloud which obscured it—and the result of any measure in the House to be less dependent on a *Bye road grant*."[31] If it really had been a sleep, the awakening was gentle.

To give Sir Edmund Head time to appreciate the New Brunswick environment Colebrooke prorogued the Legislature on March 28

[28]*Courier*, March 11, 1848.
[29]*Ibid.*, Jan. 23, 1848.
[30]*Ibid.*, Jan. 29, 1848.
[31]*Ibid.*, Feb. 19, 1848.

amid "great unanimity and public spirit."[32] But the emancipator and philanthropist could fight rearguard actions. Grey had urged him to secure the initiative for the executive and to establish municipal corporations. Could not the Canadian precedent of 1840 be invoked? Could not legislative guarantee be won for these saving changes in return for the great surrender? But Grey would not bargain.[33] "The Reign of Smoothery" ended. "The light which once shone upon us with startling brilliancy is now flickering in its socket of disappointed hope . . . but it will rise again on the benighted mountains of Demerara."[34]

The principle had been conceded. The formula of Durham and the idealism of Grey, the reason of Baldwin and the rhetoric of Howe, had been given the deference which seemed fitting. But the hard work of applying the new doctrine in its austerity to the practical politics of the country was only to commence with the coming of Sir Edmund Head.[35] And the historians of enlightenment were later to have many strictures for the politicians who at this stage failed to understand it or who baulked its full implementation.[36] The centrifugal forces of sectionalism and individual rivalries which denied the appearance of disciplined political parties comprised the principal reason for this condition. Responsible Government had come but the men who remained at the centre of affairs were, for the most part, those who had opposed its appeal or ignored its reason. In this respect New Brunswick was in sharp contrast to both Nova Scotia and Canada where the new system immediately gave to the Reformers the opportunity of showing their mettle.

Head's task was simplified by the immediate possibility of filling two major posts with men who commanded the confidence of the Legislature. The Attorney-General had died and Saunders, the Provincial Secretary, had held office only since 1845, six years after the dispatch of Lord John Russell on the tenure of office. The public was expecting a change in the composition of the Executive Council. "What has taken place in Nova Scotia has operated here also."[37]

[32]P.A.C., C.O. 188/203, Colebrooke to Grey, April 11, 1848.

[33]*Ibid.*, Colebrooke to Grey, Feb. 8, March 25, 1848; C.O. 188/176, Grey to Colebrooke, March 4, 1848.

[34]*Loyalist*, Dec. 23, 1847.

[35]Another writer concurs in this point of view. See D. G. G. Kerr, "Head and Responsible Government in New Brunswick," *Canadian Historical Association Report*, 1938, 62–70.

[36]G. E. Fenety, *Political Notes* (Fredericton, 1867), Introduction; James Hannay, *History of New Brunswick* (Saint John, 1909), vol. II.

[37]P.A.C., C.O. 188/110, Head to Grey, April 22, 1848.

It was necessary to act quickly to strengthen the Government in the Legislature, for a great variety of reports were being circulated. There was a large number of claimants for the attorney-generalship. Kinnear, the Solicitor-General, had loyally served the Government for years. John Ambrose Street had seniority at the Bar. But the man whose assistance would be most valuable to the Government was Lemuel Allen Wilmot. "Mr. Wilmot is well aware of the position he holds at the present moment. He looks upon himself as the persevering and consistent advocate of those principles of Responsible Government which have been recognized by Her Majesty's Government at home and he expects to reap the benefit of that consistency."[38] There was less uncertainty concerning the secretaryship. It was logical that the master of all the tricks of the old system should take precedence under the new. There was no opposition for Partelow, the man of many compromises. "He is, I believe, more conversant with the financial affairs of the province than any other who could be suggested and his opinion has the greatest weight in the Assembly in all matters relating to money."[39]

Other changes were made. Fisher, the second Reformer of York, entered the Government with Wilmot. The most eloquent orator and the keenest analyst of the newly formed "Liberal party" deserted their followers at the very moment when their principles were vindicated. Betrayal was the word in vogue and for five years the Liberal rump was to be disorganized and ineffective. But the Government possessed the great merit of being weighty and broad-bottomed in the Assembly. Partelow's presence, alone, was almost a certain guarantee of this. Head himself described it as "a sort of coalition government in which those who were the leaders of the Liberal party and moderate conservatives have both united."[40]

But all was not quite such clear sailing. The *enfant terrible* of New Brunswick politics for the past quarter of a century was to be the only major cause of disquietude for Head at this stage. Thomas Baillie, the Surveyor-General, had held office since 1824 and his case was therefore not considered within the compass of Earl Grey's dispatch. The House of Assembly was adamantly set against a pension for Baillie or for any other office-holder. Grey had insisted upon pensions for office-holders who should be retired to make way for the responsible system. But since this provision was not honoured Baillie remained as an irresponsible occupant of

[38]*Ibid.*, Head to Grey, May 20, 1848, confidential.
[39]*Ibid.*
[40]*Ibid.*, Head to Grey, Jan. 6. 1849.

one of the most important public posts. Even he had gone almost the full round. Prior to 1837 he had been the arbitrary keeper of the Crown Lands. In 1848 he had become a popular tribune, had gained a seat in the House of Assembly for York County by reason of the great support given him by the electors of Stanley who had only recently gained freehold tenure and the franchise. There had been a long trail of public persecution and private bankruptcy. But Baillie had lasted it out. On Head's insistence he withdrew from his seats in the Executive Council and the Legislature. But not until 1851 was he removed from office by the payment of a retirement allowance from the surplus of the Civil List Fund, the only financial source remaining to the Crown. The ability of Head to place this office on a political basis still further strengthened his Government at this later stage.[41]

One or two general considerations remain. The question of the initiative was not parochial but fundamental. It is one which the historians of Nova Scotia, that community which has provided so much of the literature of emancipation, in their determination to immortalize the pronouncements of Howe, have avoided. For the essential contradiction which remained untouched by the settlement of 1848 we can appeal for evidence to the great reputation of Sir Edmund Head and to one of his valedictory letters upon the finances of New Brunswick: "A great deal has been said in these colonies on the question of 'Responsible Government' but the one peculiar subject on which the Executive Government ought to be more responsible to the representatives of the people—the relation of expenditure to revenue—is practically conducted to exclude all responsibility."[42]

In New Brunswick the initiative of money grants by committees of the House of Assembly continued until 1858. Nearly a year elapsed before the Lieutenant-Governor was really certain that it had happened—a delay which caused considerable bewilderment at the Colonial Office but which was founded upon experience of the uncertain temper of New Brunswick democracy.[43]

If emancipation had really come there was a more fundamental reason to account for it than the realization of "Responsible Government." For the organic change in the government of New Brunswick was an undertone to other changes which affected almost every individual in the province in the most direct and material manner.

[41]*Ibid.*, 188/114, Head to Grey, May 26, 1851.
[42]*Ibid.*, 188/121, Head to Newcastle, Jan. 14, 1854.
[43]C.O. 188/132, Manners-Sutton to Newcastle, Dec. 28, 1858.

The current of feeling in Canada upon the repeal of the British duties protecting timber and other colonial products is well known. But the much more highly specialized economy of New Brunswick received in 1848 a staggering blow from which men considered it could not recover. All over the province meetings were called to consider the urgency for new markets. Cables were being slipped and unknown oceans lay ahead. The palladium of empire had been hacked away by men of perverse understanding and economic heresies who had lost all sense of kinship with the British overseas.

> The tone of feeling in this colony is somewhat peculiar and is by no means understood in England though it is easy to account for. The principal inhabitants of New Brunswick have been and are by descent and by inclination loyal in their feelings and strongly attached to the British Crown. They have felt a pride in forming an integral part of a mighty empire and the sense of self-importance connected with this feeling receives a shock from every expression or every fact which seems to impair this unity. In addition therefore to the immediate effect on their material interests produced by the withdrawal of full protection to their timber trade their sympathies received what may be called a moral blow.[44]

There were other excitements. On July 12, 1849, a procession of Orangemen formed in Saint John and marched for York Point, the section of the city which was congested with the homes of the newly immigrant Irish. On their way up a hill they came to an arch decorated with greenery, constructed to such a height that they would be forced to dip their banners should they march through. The brawl which ensued resulted in casualties which could not be counted. Deaths were concealed and funerals took place in the early morning hours so that evidence of triumph for one side or calamity for another would never be known. The magistrates had fled the city. The Mayor, who had attempted to frustrate the encounter, had his head cut open by a brick, was tossed into a cellar, and barely escaped with his life. This had come as a climax to mounting disorder which had lasted for three years. There were causes other than Responsible Government to fight and die for.

In 1849 little evidence was available to indicate that the era of almost continuous progress prior to Confederation lay ahead. The population was heterogeneous, and there were also the physical barriers of wilderness to the achievement of a union of minds or of hearts. When Sir Edmund Head in the summer of 1849 crossed by portage from the St. John to the Miramichi he spent five nights in the woods. The St. John was not to New Brunswick as the St.

[44]P.A.C., C.O. 188/110, Head to Grey, March 31, 1849.

Lawrence was to Canada. And the austere city which stood at its estuary was no Montreal where capital was expended for provincial development. Saint John monopolized the trade of the valley and to a great extent that of western Nova Scotia. But the great controversy concerning the route of the Halifax and Quebec Railway was to show how oblivious the leaders of that city could be to the material interests and aggrandized ambitions of the northern and eastern shores. There the citizens of each little community, looking towards the sea and nurtured on dreams of future prosperity and importance, regarded their port or haven as the eventual link between the still unexploited interior and the markets overseas. The spirit of local independence stood in the way of grand designs or of harnessed power.

Moral evils resulted from this physical and economic imperfection. The body politic was a scramble of local loyalties and prejudices which made leadership difficult and statesmanship impossible. Provincial administration was stultified and weakened. The enormous amount of private bills which were passed by the legislature showed how that body had become an instrument of privilege for a few rather than a source of law for all. Communities looked beyond the seas for guidance rather than to Fredericton. But the mother country, while extending greater political liberty, had denied to her children what seemed to be the material fruits of their inheritance. Canada was known only as having rejected all attempts to establish free trade and as the opposite party in the dispute upon the common boundary. All things considered it is probably a testimony to the preservation of the Loyalist spirit and to the tact and good management of Sir Edmund Head that the destruction of the preferential trade system did not produce in New Brunswick more violent gravitations towards the expanding economy of the United States.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DECIMAL CURRENCY IN CANADA

By D. C. Masters

THE concession of responsible government in the 1840's indicated a change of the most profound significance in the attitude of the Colonial Office towards the Province of Canada and the other British North American colonies. A world of difference lay between Lord Stanley who advised the Canadian Governor to be a sort of patriot king in 1842 and Earl Grey who declared in 1846 that the Governor must accept the advice of those ministers who controlled a majority in the colonial Legislature.[1] In short the Colonial Office had turned the corner toward colonial self-government. The implications of this concession, however, were much more slowly realized by the British Treasury, which persisted in regarding Canada as a colony and which fought an extended rearguard action to prevent Canada from securing control of its own currency. The Treasury was most sensitive about the royal prerogative and showed a distressing tendency to recommend the disallowance of Canadian financial legislation particularly in regard to the currency. Even more exasperating was the Treasury's habit of reading to the Canadian Government dogmatic lectures predicting unfortunate results for policies which Canadian governments were determined to establish. They were couched in a tone of condescending superiority which was particularly galling to Canadian pride. Eventually Canada won out in the struggle to control its own currency, as indeed to exercise financial autonomy in general. The stubborn facts of the nature of Canadian trade and of Canadian financial development were too much for the omniscience of the Treasury, and it graciously yielded. By the year 1858 Canada controlled its own currency and was inaugurating the decimal system. Precisely why the Canadians decided to adopt a currency with the dollar rather than the pound as the unit is a question which will be considered below.

[1]*Imperial Blue Books Relating to Canada*, 1844–8, XV, Earl Grey to Sir John Harvey, Nov. 3, 1846, quoted in W. P. M. Kennedy, ed., *Statutes, Treaties and Documents of the Canadian Constitution, 1713–1929* (Toronto, 1930), 494–6.

Vol. XXXIII, no. 2, June, 1952

The extension of self-government to include control of the currency was largely the work of Francis Hincks, who dominated Canadian financial policy from 1848 to 1854 as Inspector-General and from 1851 as Prime Minister. Hincks's remarkable ability as a debater and financier has been vividly described in a contemporary account during the session of the Legislature in 1843.

> He had a portable desk beside him and a heap of papers. He was as busy as a nailer, writing, reading, marking down pages, whispering to the man on the front seat, sending a slip of paper to this one and that one, a hint to the member speaking; there was no mistaking that man. Presently he stood up and started off full drive,—half a dozen voices cry out, "Hear, hear!" "No! No!" He picks up a slip of paper and the whole House is silent. The figures come tumbling out like potatoes from a basket. He snatches up a journal or some other document, and having established his position he goes ahead again. The inspector-general, Mr. Hincks, is decidedly the man of that House.[2]

One cannot read his memoranda on the currency, always aimed at the Treasury, without a profound admiration for his grasp of Canadian financial practices and problems. He wrote with great vigour and there was always an edge to his language particularly when he was annoyed. When Sir Charles Trevelyan of the Treasury suggested that Hincks's ideas might have resulted from an imperfect knowledge of the law, he replied contemptuously: "The undersigned deems it unnecessary to notice the imputation that a person occupying the position which he has the honour to fill in this Province, could possibly be ignorant of the fact that gold was a legal tender as well as silver."[3] Hincks's ability made a considerable impression on Lord Elgin, who was a shrewd appraiser of men. Elgin declared to Earl Grey: "Now, whatever you may please to think of Hincks' opinions on Currency, he is certainly an able man and has more energy than all the Canadian Statesmen I have yet had to do with put together."[4] Grey had a habit of accepting Elgin's views which he came to regard as his own. In this case he had first-hand evidence in the form of Hincks's memoranda and he assured Elgin: "I am bound to admit that in the controversy on the currency act lately disallowed I think that Hincks has much the best of it with the Treasury."[5]

[2]*Examiner*, Toronto, Oct. 25, 1843, quoted in Stephen Leacock, *Baldwin, Lafontaine, Hincks*, The Makers of Canada, ed. Duncan C. Scott and Edgar Pelham, IX (Toronto, 1909), 179–80.

[3]P.A.C., Series G9, vol. 27, 151–87, Elgin to Grey, no. 67, May 16, 1851, enclosing memorandum by Francis Hincks, May 14, 1851.

[4]*Elgin-Grey Papers, 1846–1852*, ed. Sir Arthur G. Doughty (Ottawa, 1937), Elgin to Grey, May 17, 1851.

[5]*Ibid.*, Grey to Elgin, June 13, 1851.

The desire of Canadians to control the currency was a result of specific grievances which they felt in the 1840's and 1850's. These were the result of long-standing conditions in Canada and in the other British North American colonies. Neither Canada nor the other colonies had ever had a local coinage, so that they had to depend upon Great Britain, the United States, Mexico, and other countries for their supply of coins. In the British American colonies, the value assigned to these foreign coins, originally determined by the people, was afterwards altered and modified by acts of the local legislatures.[6] Lower Canada passed such acts in 1796 and 1808 and Upper Canada followed suit in 1796, 1809, 1827, and 1836. In 1841 the Legislature of the united Canadas passed the act 4 & 5 Vict., c. 35, to establish a uniform system in Canada East and West. In all of these acts the value of British and foreign coins was quoted in terms of colonial currency. While bank-notes were issued bearing the denominations of colonial currency, there was of course no colonial coinage. Colonial currency, in its relation to the coinage, was merely a system of accounting in pounds, shillings, and pence and was employed to establish the relative value of British and foreign coins. Thus in the Upper Canadian act of 1827 Spanish and American dollars were rated at 5*s.* currency, the British crown at 5*s.* 9*d.* currency, the British shilling at 1*s.* 2*d.* currency, and so on. While currency was reckoned in pounds, shillings, and pence, the Spanish dollar, in the British-American colonies, was considered the principal measure of exchange and the basis of pecuniary contracts. The nominal rate assigned to the dollar was 4*s.* 6*d.*, which corresponded to the value of the coin in sterling money as stated in the table of assaye, weights, and values by Sir Isaac Newton of the Royal Mint in 1717. The nominal value of the dollar underwent considerable change in the United States and in the British-American colonies. In Nova Scotia it was rated at 5*s.* Halifax currency, the figure which prevailed throughout the British-American provinces.

This system was always less than satisfying because it did not provide the colonists with an adequate supply of coin. This was eminently true of Canada in the forties and fifties. Gold, which had

[6][James Pennington], *The Currency of the British Colonies* (London, 1848), 63–86. For additional material on the early history of the currency in Canada see the articles by Adam Shortt on the history of Canadian currency, banking, and exchange in the *Journal of the Canadian Bankers' Association*, V–XIV, 1897–1906, especially "Free Banking and Currency Amendments," X, 1902, 12–29 and "The Introduction of the Decimal System," XI, 1903, 13–30.

been at a premium in Canada since 1841, as it had been for many years previously, had practically disappeared, and only silver and copper were in circulation. Silver dollars, American, Mexican, and those from Central and South America, and small British and American coins circulated in the colony.[7] British half-crowns and shillings, described by a Canadian banker in 1855 as "both very unsuitable and inconvenient coins" were still in considerable use. Canadians complained of the shortage of small coins for making change. To remedy this lack such devices as unauthorized bank tokens and merchant scrip were resorted to. In spite of such devices the shortage was difficult to remedy, as was indicated by a complaint from the Inspector-General's Office in 1850 that the Bank of Upper Canada had encountered opposition from the Treasury to its efforts to import a supply of copper coinage from Great Britain.[8] Another standing grievance was the alleged overvaluation of the silver dollar, particularly the American silver dollar in terms of Canadian currency. In Canada, the silver dollar had been rated at 5*s*. 1*d*. currency in the act of 1841 (4 & 5 Vict., c. 35). This rating had been forced upon Canada by the Treasury and reluctantly accepted by the Canadian Legislature under threats that the act would not otherwise be accepted.

In the decade which followed, Canadians continued to insist that the correct rating of the silver dollar in Canada was 5*s*.[9] Despite Canadian protests the Treasury refused to accept revaluation of the dollar in Canada. This was particularly galling because of the variations which existed among the various British North American colonies. The American dollar was rated at 5*s*. 1*d*. in Canada, 5*s*. in New Brunswick, 5*s*. 2½*d*. in Nova Scotia, and 6*s*. 2*d*. in Prince Edward Island.[10]

[7]American silver dollars had never been a factor of much importance in the United States. The Mint Act of 1792 placed gold and silver in a ratio of one to fifteen, i.e. the gold dollar contained 24.75 grains of pure gold and the silver dollar 371.25 grains of pure silver. In the first ten years after 1792 a little over a million silver dollars were issued but were exchanged for Spanish dollars and disappeared from the country. Discontinuance of the coinage of silver dollars was ordered by Jefferson in 1806. By the act of June 28, 1834 the weight of the American gold dollar was made 23.22 grains of pure gold. This established a ratio between gold and silver of sixteen to one. As this was an undervaluation of silver, silver dollars were rarely seen in the United States after 1840. See D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States* (New York, 1936), 103–4, 210–12.

[8]P.A.C., Correspondence of Governor-General's Secretary, no. 5375, Memorandum from Inspector-General's office, June 3, 1850.

[9]Memorandum by Francis Hincks, May 14, 1851.

[10]P.A.C., Series G, vol. 139, Grey to Elgin, private, Dec. 26, 1851, enclosing memorandum from the Treasury.

These specific grievances led to a desire that Canada should control its own currency. No doubt this desire was the result of a growing feeling of Canadian self-respect. According to Hincks a distinctive coinage would be "a source of gratification and pride" to Canadians. In addition, the closeness of economic relations between Canada and the United States made it advisable that the Canadian should be closely assimilated to the American currency.[11]

II

To remedy Canadian grievances and to satisfy Canadian desires and ambitions Hincks, in 1850, introduced "An Act to amend the Currency Act of this Province."[12] This act, an amendment to the act of 1841 regulating the currency, had two principal sections. It dealt with the vexed question of silver dollars by fixing their value at 5*s.* currency, as Canadians had demanded ever since 1841. The most important section empowered the governor-in-council to cause silver coins to be struck for circulation in the province. These were to pass for 5*s.*, 2*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.*, 1*s.* 3*d.*, 1*s.*, 6*d.*, and 3*d.* currency, and each was to be legal tender respectively to the amount of £2 10*s.* currency. The governor-in-council was also empowered to cause gold coins to be struck, for £1 5*s.*, £1, 12*s.* 6*d.*, and 10*s.* currency, and each was to be legal tender to any amount.

This act received the royal assent, i.e. the signature of Lord Elgin, the Governor-General, on August 10, and commenced its operation on January 1, 1851. The Treasury, however, viewed it with a jaundiced eye and thus began a struggle which culminated in the issue of a Canadian decimal currency in 1858.

The first phase of the struggle might be entitled "*Hincks* v. *the Treasury*." It was a period of strenuous controversy which began in October of 1850 and ended in July of the following year. It was really the decisive phase in Canada's progress toward control of its currency. Although Hincks lost out in the immediate dispute which culminated in the disallowance of the currency act of 1850, he made such an impression on the Colonial Office and the Treasury that a compromise solution was achieved in 1852 and 1853. This compromise went halfway in granting Canadian demands and made the ultimate achievement of 1858 almost inevitable.

The Treasury opened the campaign of 1850–1 with a memorandum to the Colonial Office dated October 24, severely criticizing

[11]Memorandum by Francis Hincks, May 14, 1851.

[12]*Statutes of Canada*, 1850, c. 8, "An Act to amend the Currency Act of this Province," Aug. 10, 1850.

Hincks's Currency Act of 1850 and demanding its disallowance. Their Lordships strongly objected to the revaluation of silver dollars which they described as "a measure which would have the certain effect of causing a temporary derangement of the monetary affairs of the Province." The ground of disallowance was the claim of the Treasury that the sections empowering the Governor-in-Council to issue coinage were a violation of the royal prerogative. "Their Lordships entertain strong objections on many grounds to such an enactment," proclaimed the memorandum, "but it is sufficient to observe that it involves an uncalled for and most objectionable interference with the Prerogative of the Crown." The memorandum closed with a scathing censure of Lord Elgin for allowing such an act to pass without a clause suspending its operation until the pleasure of Her Majesty (i.e. the British Government) was known.[13] Earl Grey, the Colonial Secretary, appeared to agree with the Treasury. In his letter covering the dispatch of the Treasury's memorandum he informed Elgin that he thought the act should have been reserved and that it must now be disallowed.

Hincks was undaunted by this opening salvo from the Treasury and replied with a firm memorandum in November, 1850.[14] Crisply he made his points. Canada had long felt the need for a colonial coinage without which the country had been compelled to depend on the currencies of foreign nations. Since disallowance would cause great embarrassment in Canada it would be better if the Treasury left the Currency Act in operation and allowed the Canadian Legislature to repeal the offensive portions at the next session. None of the people who were really concerned with the revaluation of the silver dollar, Canadian bankers, merchants, and traders, entertained the objections which had been raised by the Treasury. Hincks insisted that he could not see why the dollar should be overvalued in Canada nor why the currency in Canada should not be assimilated to that of the United States. Owing to the great intercourse between the two countries, he asserted, it was most desirable that their respective coins should be "of precisely similar value." A uniform currency among the British North American colonies was no doubt desirable also, but, Hincks concluded roundly, "it would be much more expedient to assimilate it to that of the United States than to continue a depreciated coinage."

[13]P.A.C., Series G, vol. 137, 515, Grey to Elgin, private, Oct. 25, 1850, enclosing C. E. Trevelyan to H. Merivale, Oct. 24, 1850.

[14]P.A.C., Canada East Miscellaneous Papers, Memorandum by Francis Hincks, Nov. 1950.

Upon receipt of this memorandum Grey commenced to relent and informed Elgin that he thought that the Canadian Legislature should have an opportunity to amend the Currency Act.[15] The Treasury, however, did not flag or falter but answered Hincks on February 20, 1851 in a lengthy memorandum repeating the arguments in favour of the royal prerogative and against the revaluation of the silver dollar. In its argument that the dollar would be undervalued at 5*s.*, the Treasury asserted categorically that the silver dollar was usually at a premium in the United States and the gold Eagle did not represent the value of ten silver dollars. In any case, continued the Treasury, since foreign coins were rated in Canada by comparison with the British sovereign, the silver dollar was properly valued at 5*s.* 1*d.* Their Lordships would not accept "an arbitrary valuation" of the dollar simply to remove a small grievance in Canada. A special coinage for British North America would be impossible until the currencies of all the colonies had been assimilated. In the meantime, their Lordships favoured the use of British currency in the colony. Admittedly this would not combine as well as was desirable with the American currency; but, much more important to their Lordships, it would "facilitate the adjustment of Trade with the Mother Country."[16] On April 14 the order-in-council disallowing the Currency Act of 1850 was duly passed at Buckingham Palace.[17]

One may ask why the Treasury acted as it did. The Treasury's argument was in part legalistic and constitutional, i.e. Canada was trespassing upon the royal prerogative. In fact it was pragmatic. Canadian policy was unwise and would result in "a temporary derangement of the monetary affairs of the province." There was a suggestion of mercantilism in the Treasury's desire to maintain the use of British currency in Canada because it would "facilitate the adjustment of Trade with the Mother Country." To a great extent the Treasury was motivated by a desire to prevent colonial politicians from making fools of themselves. It was a desire not the less irritating to Canadians because it was genuine.

Hincks rose to the occasion with a vengeance. Upon the arrival of the Treasury memorandum of February 20 and the order-in-

[15]*Elgin-Grey Papers*, Grey to Elgin, Dec. 5, 1850.

[16]*Ibid.*, Appendix 26, Grey to Elgin, no. 575, April 9, 1851, enclosing C. E. Trevelyan to H. Merivale, Feb. 20, 1851.

[17]*Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, X, 1851, Appendix Y.Y., July 28, 1851, Grey to Elgin, April 15, 1851, enclosing order of Her Majesty in Council, April 14, 1851.

council of April 14, he mustered all his not inconsiderable resources and replied on May 14, in a lengthy memorandum which is the fullest statement of the Canadian position.[18] It was the best example of Hincks's capacity as a minister of finance. It was able, lucid, closely argued, at times scathing and even impassioned. Hincks began by rejecting the argument that in issuing currency Canada would be trespassing on the royal prerogative. He insisted that, when Emerich Vattel, the celebrated Swiss jurist, said in his *Law of Nations* that the coinage was a function of the sovereign alone, he meant by the term sovereign "the Sovereign power of the state, or in countries enjoying free constitutions, the Legislature." If the two houses of the British Parliament could pass an act regulating the coinage of the United Kingdom, Hincks insisted, there was no reason why the two houses of the Canadian Legislature could not pass an act regulating the coinage in Canada, with the same consent.

Hincks's consideration of the Treasury's objection to the revaluation of the silver dollar was particularly scathing. The Treasury had objected to any "arbitrary" valuation of the silver dollar. Hincks argued in effect that any valuation was bound to be arbitrary since a number of dollars of different intrinsic values circulated in Canada, of which the Mexican was in most general use. With evident relish he proceeded to instruct Sir C. Trevelyan, the spokesman for the Treasury, in the intricacies of North American coinage. "Sir C. Trevelyan," asserted Hincks, "is either ignorant of the fact, or else he has not given to it the weight to which it is clearly entitled, that there are no less than eight Mints in Mexico, the coins struck at which differ from each other in weight and fineness; nay, more, the coins struck at the same Mint in different years differ from one another in value from one-half to one per cent." He went on to say that "no reliance can be placed on calculations as to the value of silver dollars as compared with the gold Sovereign." The American dollar, he reiterated, should be rated at 5*s*., which was as near as possible to its intrinsic value.

Returning to the question of a Canadian coinage Hincks deplored the opposition of the Treasury which he described as unnecessary. He insisted that it was more important for Canada to assimilate its currency to that of the United States than to have a common currency among the British North American colonies.

Hincks closed with an eloquent denunciation of Treasury obstruction which he described as at variance with the concession of responsible government.

[18]Memorandum by Francis Hincks, May 14, 1851.

It seems to the undersigned [he asserted] that if the Canadian Parliament, with the concurrence of Her Majesty's representative, cannot be permitted to pass such an Act as that under consideration, it is very questionable how far they are fit to enjoy representation at all. . . . Following out the liberal views of Colonial Policy which have been for some years avowed by the Imperial Government and Parliament, deference has been paid to Parliamentary Majorities in Canada in points of great public importance, while at the same time irritation is kept up by interference in matters of really trivial importance as far as imperial interests are concerned, but regarding which the entire public opinion of Canada is united.

Canada would return to the attempt to put its currency on a more satisfactory basis, Hincks predicted. He ended by insisting grimly "that it will be most inexpedient to continue the present warfare between Canada and the Treasury Department on a point on which the former is convinced she is right, but which is of no importance whatever to the interests of the Empire."

Hincks's memorandum drew blood. The reply of the Treasury was still superior but not so urbane.[19] The Treasury insisted that the regulation of the currency rested with the Crown and added that "it must remain in the breast of the Sovereign, subject to the Constitutional advice of Her Ministers." Hincks had argued that if the Imperial Parliament could pass an act for the regulation of the currency in the United Kingdom with the assent of the Crown there was no reason why the Canadian Legislature, with the same assent, could not pass an act providing for a Canadian currency. This argument the Treasury ignored and insisted that if the Governor-General issued coinage on the advice of his Canadian ministers, he would be trespassing on "a right hitherto reserved in the person of the Sovereign." They suggested that the Governor-General could be empowered to defray the expenses attending coinage without being given the power to coin.

The Treasury took pained notice of Hincks's remarks in regard to the rating of silver dollars. Their Lordships had been "perfectly aware" that dollars coined in various South American states and in Mexico differed to some extent in weight and fineness. Although they had asserted that silver dollars were at a premium in the United States they had known that this was not technically correct in the case of the American dollar, which was rated as one-tenth of an Eagle. The American dollar, however, was undervalued as was shown by the fact that the Mexican dollar, which was only slightly superior in intrinsic value, was usually at a premium varying from

[19]P.A.C., Series G, vol. 139, no. 634, Grey to Elgin, Aug. 14, 1851, enclosing G. Cornewall Lewis to H. Merivale, July 4, 1851.

2 to 3 per cent. At this point the Treasury indulged in a sneer, explaining suavely: "It was in this sense that my Lords referred in their former communication in general terms to the agio on Dollars in the United States, but as they did not conceive that their meaning could have been misunderstood by a person who must be so conversant with the whole subject as the financial member of the Canadian Government, they thought it unnecessary at the time to enter into the foregoing explanatory details." The Treasury closed by expressing disappointment that Hincks had not been more enthusiastic about the adoption of a uniform currency for the British North American colonies and by urging Grey to continue to press for it.

In regard to the merits of the dispute, the author is of the opinion that Hincks got the better of the Treasury. There was no reply to his argument that a currency act passed by the Canadian Legislature was not a violation of the Queen's prerogative. In telling fashion he had established his claim that it was unwise of the home Government to fly in the face of the fixed opinions of Canadian governments and financial interests in matters which were of grave concern to Canada and of little importance to the mother country. This argument undoubtedly had a restraining effect upon the Treasury in the subsequent stage of the controversy. In the acrimonious exchange over silver dollars in Canada, Hincks made it clear that the question was much more complex than the Treasury had indicated in its memorandum of February 20, 1851. He had also demonstrated that any blanket valuation of silver dollars was bound to be arbitrary. Neither party to the dispute was particularly polite to the other; but Hincks in his righteous indignation emerged with greater dignity than the Treasury with its condescension.

III

With the receipt of the Treasury's memorandum of July 4, 1851 Hincks seemed to have failed completely in his attempt to improve the currency in Canada. His Currency Act of 1850 had been disallowed and his protests had not changed the decision of the Treasury. Actually success was much closer that was apparent. Elgin, who was annoyed at the way in which Hincks had been snubbed, took up the cudgels on his behalf and complained to Grey, "I fear that we shall have a great deal of difficulty in conducting the Government of this Colony if the opinions of the Canadian Statesmen and Legislatures on Currency and Banking questions are to be wholly disregarded."[20] Grey agreed that the opinions of the Canadian Parliament on currency and banking should by no means be disregarded

[20] *Elgin-Grey Papers*, Elgin to Grey, May 17, 1851.

and even added magnanimously that he was disposed to allow that colony to make "very foolish laws" if it was determined to do so, providing it was given an opportunity to reconsider them in the light of British objections.[21] By the end of the year 1851 the Treasury had made a proposal which went part way toward Hincks's position and which made possible the compromise of 1853.

Hincks provided the occasion for the new Treasury proposal by returning to the attack with the passage of another Canadian currency act in August of 1851.[22] Unlike the act of 1850 this new piece of legislation made specific proposals in reference to a decimal currency. It provided that as soon as practicable the public accounts of the province should be kept in dollars and decimal parts of the dollar to be called cents and mills respectively. It provided that such coins representing dollars and divisions of the dollar should be legal tender in Canada, gold coins to any amount and silver coins up to $10. Hincks met the Treasury's previous objections in reference to the royal prerogative by providing that the new coins should be "such . . . as Her Majesty shall see fit to direct to be struck" instead of empowering the Governor-General as in the previous act. In addition the new act contained a reserve clause the absence of which in his previous act had occasioned such protests.

This new proposal of Hincks must have confronted the Treasury with something of a problem. Disliking the new act, yet unwilling to engage in a second controversy by disallowing it, their Lordships made an alternative proposal. After a lengthy consideration of the issue raised in Hincks's new bill their Lordships formally suggested in June of 1852 that a distinctive Canadian coin, the pound currency, should be issued.[23] The pound currency was to be called a "Royal" and was to be the equivalent of four United States gold dollars. The Royal, with its divisions and multiples, was to be legal standard measure of value in the province. Token silver coins, divisions of the pound currency, were to be issued in the denominations of a half-crown, a shilling, a half shilling, and a quarter shilling. The Treasury suggested, in order perhaps to mollify Hincks, that it would be possible in the future to divide the pound currency into ten parts, "in the event of the proposed decimal system being fully carried out." In the meantime, although the Canadian Currency Act of 1851 was

[21] *Ibid.*, Grey to Elgin, June 13, 1851.

[22] *Statutes of Canada*, 1851, vol. 2, c. 47, "An Act to provide for the introduction of the Decimal System into the Currency of this Province, and otherwise to amend the laws relative to the Currency," Aug. 30, 1851.

[23] *Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, XI, 1852–3, Appendix P., pp. 11 ff., Memorandum of the Treasury, June 29, 1852.

not formally disallowed, Canada was asked to reconsider it in the light of this new suggestion.[24]

The Treasury, in this memorandum, met Hincks halfway. The immediate establishment of a decimal currency, with the dollar as the unit, was, of course, avoided; but the Treasury had at least proposed a distinctive Canadian coinage and had even intimated that it might accept a system of decimal coinage if the pound currency was the unit. In addition the proposal that the pound currency should be the equivalent of four American dollars was an admission of Hincks's claim that the foreign, and particularly the American, silver dollar should be valued at 5*s*. currency.

This proposal of the Treasury gave Hincks his opportunity. He now introduced a new measure which included a part of the Treasury scheme but in addition significant additional measures which the Treasury had not suggested but which he very much desired. The pound currency, proposed by the Treasury, and the dollar currency were to hold the field side by side.[25] The denominations of money in the currency of the province, said the act, were to be pounds, dollars, shillings, pence, cents, and mills. The dollar currency was to equal one-quarter of a pound currency. In any statement as to money or money value in agreements, indictments, or legal proceedings, said the act, sums might be mentioned in pounds, shillings, and pence or in dollars, cents, and mills. Provision was even made for the public accounts of the province to be kept in dollars and cents. They were to be kept, said the act, in such denominations of currency money of the province as Her Majesty should direct.

Hincks introduced his new act in November, 1852. It was duly passed and received the royal assent on June 14, 1853. Hincks thus contrived to write into the statutes a currency system based on the dollar and its divisions and multiples. The act left the issuance of such coinage to the pleasure of Her Majesty. It was a pleasure that was not exercised and no such coinage was issued under the act of 1853. At least, however, the decimal currency based on the dollar

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 11, no. 48, Sir John Pakington to Elgin, July 17, 1852.

[25]*Statutes of Canada*, 1852–3, c. 158, "An Act to regulate the Currency," June 14, 1853. At the beginning of the debate on this measure Hincks proposed to accept the suggestion of the Treasury by adopting the Royal as the unit of account. The Royal, the equivalent of the half-pound currency, was to be divisible into ten shillings currency and a new coin, the mark, equal to a tenth of a shilling was to be issued. This suggestion was received with general disfavour on both sides of the house. George Brown and John A. Macdonald both advocated the American decimal system. Hincks accordingly abandoned the system of royals, shilling, and marks. See Shortt, "The Introduction of the Decimal System."

had secured legal recognition. It remained to convert such recognition into actual practice.

IV

As Hincks had no doubt foreseen, dollars and cents soon won out in Canada over shillings and pence. In 1854 the Standing Committee on Public Accounts was instructed by the Canadian Legislative Assembly "to inquire into and report upon the expediency of keeping the Provincial Accounts in Decimal Currency."[26] This was simply an oblique method of inquiring upon the expediency of establishing the decimal currency for general use in Canada. The committee secured opinions from a considerable number of men prominent in the political and business life of Canada. Opinions quoted in the return to the order appeared to indicate general unanimity in favour of the decimal currency.[27] Among those supporting it were George Brown, William Hamilton Merritt, Isaac Buchanan; a number of bankers including William Sache, Cashier of Molson's Bank and D. Davidson, Cashier of the Bank of British North America; merchants including T. S. Brown of Montreal, William Lyman & Co., Montreal druggists; Benjamin Holmes, Secretary of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, D. Lorn MacDougall, a Montreal broker, and John Dougall, editor of the Montreal *Witness*.

A particularly able statement was written by John Langton, at the time M.P. for Peterborough County, but soon to become Auditor-General for the province. Langton asserted that the decimal system possessed obvious advantages in the keeping of accounts and especially in complicated calculations. Most Canadian business men, he said, performed interest calculations in dollars and cents although they entered the results in pounds, shillings, and pence. Even in England, he said, accountants and actuaries stated sums in decimals of a pound into which pounds, shillings, and pence were convertible by an easy rule. Some arguments there were in favour of the pound, he admitted, particularly that it could be divided in eighteen different ways or, including farthings, in twenty-five ways while the dollar could be divided only in seven ways. He concluded "that it is very desirable to introduce, as soon as possible, a decimal currency both of accounts and of circulation." He argued further that the dollar should be made the unit of the Canadian currency because it was already the unit of a decimal scale, while the pound currency was not, and because of Canada's commercial transactions with the

[26] *Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, XIII, 1854–5, 172.
[27] *Legislative Council of Canada, Sessional Papers*, no. 10, 1854–5, Appendix J.J.

United States which were almost as extensive as those with Great Britain. Langton pointed out, as did Benjamin Holmes of the Grand Trunk, that Canadians were just as familiar with the dollar as with the pound as the unit of currency. This was particularly true in the most westerly part of southern Canada and in the Eastern Townships.[28] "In every point of view," concluded Langton, "I would give the preference to the dollar, as the unit of a decimal currency."

Although there was strong support for the immediate introduction of a decimal currency with the dollar as the unit, the Conservative administration which had taken office in 1854 hesitated for a time to take decisive action. "Until it had assimilated some of its incongruous elements and eliminated others," comments Adam Shortt, "the new ministry was inefficient and apparently overwhelmed with the magnitude of its inheritance. Mr. Cayley in particular [the Finance Minister] proved himself as little capable of taking a large and intelligent grasp of financial measures, after the Hincks' regime as before it."[29] In 1855, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, under William Lyon Mackenzie who had returned from exile, reported a resolution in the Legislative Assembly that "there shall be but one currency or money of account, of which the dollar shall be the highest or principal unit, that the public accounts shall be kept in dollars, cents and mills, and that the coinage be equal in intrinsic value to that of the United States." No immediate action was taken. In the following year, 1856, Mackenzie moved the same resolution. He was supported in his insistence upon immediate action by George Brown and the Clear Grit Opposition in the Assembly. Cayley, John A. Macdonald, and George Cartier all spoke against what Macdonald described as "the American system," and Mackenzie's resolution was defeated on a straight party vote by fifty-eight to twenty-seven.[30]

Actually the Government was less obdurate than had appeared, as was shown by a debate in the Assembly on March 28, two days after the defeat of the Mackenzie resolution. Ferrie, a Radical Reformer, having moved "that this house considers it expedient that a suitable coinage be procured for this Province," complained of the great want of a suitable coinage and especially of the shortage of small coins in Canada. Cayley, the Inspector-General, although again counselling against hasty action, admitted the truth of Ferrie's

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] Shortt, "The Introduction of the Decimal System."

[30] *Globe* (Daily), Toronto, March 27, 1856. *Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, XIV, 1856, Wednesday, March 26, 186.

complaints and promised an attempt to secure a better supply of small coins.[31] A year later the Government reversed itself on the currency question. On March 6, 1857 Cayley secured leave to bring in a bill to require the accounts of the provincial government to be kept in dollars and cents.[32] The bill was duly passed and received the royal assent on June 10.[33]

This was the decisive step in the establishment of a Canadian decimal currency. The sequel was soon to follow. On August 18, 1857 Thomas Graham, the Master of the Mint, reported that the mint proposed to issue Canadian silver coins of five, ten, and twenty cents respectively. The first issue was to be £15,000 sterling each respectively of the five- and ten-cent pieces and £20,000 worth of the twenty-cent pieces. He intimated that later it would probably be advisable to issue a fifty-cent piece and copper coins. For the time being copper coins of the United Kingdom were to pass current in the province, the penny as two cents and the half-penny as one cent. On October 14, a minute of the Treasury reported that Mr. Wyon, the celebrated designer of the Royal Mint, had prepared designs for the new coins and that these had received the approval of the Governor-General.[34] Subsequently in 1858 A. T. Galt, who had succeeded Cayley as Inspector-General, requested that the Canadian order of silver coinage be increased from a total value of £50,000 sterling to £70,000 and also that £20,000 worth of copper coins which had already been sanctioned should be produced. The Treasury accordingly gave the necessary instructions to the Mint.[35]

The new coins were received in the summer of 1858 in Canada, and by 1860 John Lovell, the Montreal publisher, was advertising a textbook on arithmetic, "Revised, Improved & Adapted to the Decimal Currency."[36] The long struggle had come to an end. It was unfortunate that Hincks, who had contributed more than anyone else to that success, was safely installed as Governor of Barbados and was not in Canada to greet the new Canadian currency.

The adoption of the decimal, dollar currency in Canada was a development of the most profound importance and one may well ask why it was adopted. In this question the motives of Francis

[31] *Globe* (Daily), Toronto, March 29, 1856.

[32] *Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, XV, 1857, March 6, 1857, 40.

[33] *Statutes of Canada*, 1857, c. 18, "An Act to require accounts rendered to the Provincial Government to be so rendered in dollars and cents," June 10, 1857.

[34] P.A.C., Series G, vol. 155, no. 50, W. Labouchere to Sir Edmund Head, Oct. 24, 1857, enclosures.

[35] *Ibid.*, vol. 158, no. 109, E. B. Lytton to Sir E. Head, Dec. 30, 1858, enclosure.

[36] The advertisement appeared in *Caverhill's Toronto City Directory* for 1859–60.

Hincks are a prime consideration; it was Hincks who first opened the issue with the Treasury and who negotiated the compromise of 1853 which went more than halfway in the establishment of the decimal currency. His motives were no doubt mixed. As a Canadian he was anxious that his country should have a distinctive currency in which it could take pride. His judgment may well have been influenced also by the truculence of the Treasury. Hincks was a very able man who had done well in Canada. He would scarcely have been human if he had not resented his snubbing at the hands of the Treasury in 1850. He made no mention of a decimal currency until after the annulment of the Currency Act of 1850.[37] His subsequent efforts to establish the decimal currency may have been prompted by a determination to defy the superior beings at Westminster. Hincks's dominant motive, however, was his desire to establish a currency similar to that of the United States. He was obsessed with the importance of facilitating trade with the Americans. The other British-American colonies were of minor importance to him. He regarded the assimilation of colonial currency as perhaps desirable but not of great significance. The Americans were much more important. "With the people of the United States on the other hand," he insisted, "Canadians are brought into constant daily intercourse. They travel on the same Steamers and Railroad Cars–lodge at one another's Hotels and carry on a most extensive Commercial intercourse with each other. To have an entirely different Currency . . . would be an intolerable inconvenience."[38] Trade returns of the period largely explain Hincks's attitude. Total Canadian trade with the other North American colonies in 1850 totalled less than £300,000 compared to a total trade with the United States of over £2,800,000.[39] It must be realized that the late forties and early fifties was a period in which Canada made great efforts to cultivate trade with the United States. During the period a reciprocity treaty with the United States was being vigorously advocated by William Hamilton Merritt and other Canadians. Hincks played a prominent part in the negotiations which preceded the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854.[40] Partly this emphasis on American trade was an indication of an increased desire for Canadian autonomy; partly it was merely an extension of the spirit of colonialism. With the repeal of the Corn Laws and the general abandonment of the mercantilist empire, the

[37]Memorandum of Hincks, May 14, 1851. [38]*Ibid.*

[39]*Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, X, 1851, Appendix A. Total trade with Great Britain in 1850 totalled over £3,600,000.

[40]See R. S. Longley, *Sir Francis Hincks* (Toronto, 1943), chap. x.

Canadians had been deprived of one prop on which to lean and were looking for another. Having lost a protected market in Great Britain they were in search of another in the United States. The reliance upon American markets involved the desire for a currency similar to that of the Americans.

Canadians did not begin to recover from this American honeymoon until the partial breakdown in Canadian-American relations in the years 1864–7. Abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866 threatened Canada with the prospect of reduced trade with the United States and necessitated the search for other markets. Confederation was in part the solution to this problem.[41] However, these developments were a long way ahead in the 1850's. Not only Hincks but probably also the Conservative administration which finally introduced the decimal currency in 1857–8 was influenced by the desire to cultivate the American market. In both cases, if we are to attach weight to the advice of Canadian bankers and business men, the advantages of the decimal system for accounting purposes were a factor of prime importance.

The policy of the Treasury assumed a pattern destined to become very familiar in the long story of Canada's progress toward autonomy: early British reluctance and eventual capitulation in the face of Canadian insistence. The same course was followed in the more famous controversy in 1859 between the Duke of Newcastle and A. T. Galt over Canada's right to control its own tariff and later in the long campaign for the treaty-making power.

One might ask whether changes in government in Britain had any appreciable bearing on the progress of the currency controversy. The capitulation of the Treasury, of course, occurred during an unstable period in British party politics. During the years covered by this article no less than five administrations were in office: those of Russell, Aberdeen, Palmerston, and two headed by Derby. It is difficult to say how much influence these changes in government exerted upon the policy of the Treasury in reference to the currency issue. The influence of permanent officials, particularly of Sir Charles Trevelyan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury from 1840 to 1859, was undoubtedly considerable. It may be noted, however, that the Treasury was intransigent during the Russell administration, and began its capitulation during the first Derby administration in which Derby was First Lord of the Treasury and Disraeli Chancellor of

[41]See D. C. Masters, *The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854* (London, 1937), Epilogue, and "Reciprocity and the Genesis of a Canadian Commercial Policy," *Canadian Historical Review*, XIII, Dec., 1932, 418–28.

the Exchequer. Sir Charles Wood, the Chancellor of the Exchequer under Russell, wrote a memorandum for the Treasury dated December 30, 1851. He was most unconciliatory in his attitude, advised disallowance of Hincks's second currency act, that of August, 1851, and concluded brusquely: "There will probably be some inconvenience from the absence of small change, but this deficiency may be obviated in a great degree by the use of British Silver which is current in Canada, and which, being only a token, will not be exported."[42] After the first Derby administration had taken office the Treasury produced another memorandum, dated June 29, 1852.[43] Their Lordships appended Wood's memorandum and said that they fully concurred in his views. This was belied by their own proposals, which really gave away the whole position by tentatively conceding in principle the idea of a Canadian decimal currency. The Treasury proposals appear to have been intended as a rearguard action designed to minimize the effect of the act of August, 1851; but, as has been shown, they played into the hands of Hincks. The capitulation continued during the Aberdeen and Palmerston and the second Derby administrations; but the decisive step had been taken by the Treasury in June, 1852.

The Treasury appears to have accepted in good part its defeat at the hands of the Canadian Government. There was no real official protest from the Treasury against Canadian currency policy after 1851 and the manœuvres of the Canadian Government between 1853 and 1858 went quite unchallenged. Perhaps a sense of resentment rankled in official circles in London. This is suggested by a snub given by the Colonial Office in 1860 to the Government of New Brunswick, which had requested a supply of ten- and twenty-cent pieces similar to those in use in Canada. Sir Edmund Head was instructed to inform the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick that Her Majesty's Government had "reason to believe that those coins have not proved so acceptable to the Public in Canada as was expected." The Secretary of State was unable to say, continued the dispatch, whether it would suit the New Brunswick Government to take over some of the stock which the Canadian Government had on hand "from inability to circulate them." The dispatch had a distinct suggestion of "I-told-you-so."[44]

[42]*Elgin-Grey Papers*, Grey to Elgin, Dec. 30, 1851, enclosing memorandum by C. W.

[43]*Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada*, XI, 1852–3, Appendix P., 11 ff., Memorandum of the Treasury, June 29, 1852.

[44]P.A.C., Series G, vol. 164, C. Fortescue to Sir Edmund Head, Oct. 16, 1860.

In one particular the Treasury was perhaps right. It seems unfortunate, in the long run, that the Canadian unit of currency, like the American, was called a dollar rather than a Royal or something else. It tended to create the impression that the two should normally be exchanged at par and that, if the Canadian dollar is at a discount, it is, in some peculiar way, an indication that Canada is an inferior country to the United States. That is an attitude quite widely held in Canada among the unthinking. Whether it has exerted any effect on Canadian fiscal policy would be a question for speculation.[45]

[45]I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Public Archives of Canada for the use of transcripts of documents which are in the Archives.

THE STATE OF MAINE AND CANADIAN CONFEDERATION*

By Alice R. Stewart

ON a number of occasions during the 1860's, the United States Congress displayed a desire to interfere in Canadian affairs, some of its members going so far as to advocate taking over completely all British territory on the North American continent. It was less usual for the legislatures of individual states to express similar interest in the government or politics of Canada. The state of Maine, however, provided in 1867 an instance which is of interest not only as a contributing factor in the agitation which led to the substitution of "Dominion" for "Kingdom" in the British North America Act, but also as a link between the anti-Confederation forces in the United States and the Maritimes.

The sequence of events which led to Maine's official statement on Confederation is clear enough. The first public intimation that the state Government was contemplating such a step came on January 4, 1867, when Governor Joshua L. Chamberlain addressed the Maine Legislature. In the address he devoted a paragraph to the "scheme for the consolidation of the British Provinces on our border," which be believed to be,

> . . . along with the French Empire of Mexico, a part of the great conspiracy against Liberty on this youthful continent. The attempt to take advantage of the internal strife which so engaged our energies, and to environ us with Monarchies, was certainly not a scheme of those who were friendly to our prosperity. It has failed in its deep design; but the effort is now being made in the British Parliament to effect the consolidation of the Provinces. If it is successful, the result cannot but be injurious to us. The friends of this country in the Provinces are earnestly opposing the scheme. It is a matter of more concern to us than may appear at first sight, and I cannot fail to press the subject upon your attention, not doubting that you will see occasion to make such remonstrance as you are able, and to secure the more potent dissuasions of the United States Government.[1]

*Research for this article was made possible by a grant from the Coe Research Fund of the University of Maine.

[1]*Maine Legislative Documents*, 1867, Address of Governor Chamberlain, Jan., 1867, 32.

The task of carrying out the Governor's suggestions was delegated to the Legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Federal Relations. By February 27 the committee was ready with a long report and a set of three resolutions which were duly presented to the Legislature and accepted without debate.[2] The report began with a justification: "Any question affecting the political relations of any portion of the continent of North America is of interest to the people of the United States; more especially to the people of those States which from a frontier position have a necessary connection with those dominions, and are influenced and affected by their proximity." There follows a long discussion of the British colonization of North America, the theme being the struggle to preserve those liberties granted, according to the report, by King James I to the original colonists.

In this struggle, the colonies had attained a large measure of success. This was true not only of those which became the United States, but of the northern colonies as well. "Probably no new form of government can be devised, so generous in its administration and so free from just irritation, as that under which the North American Provinces are this day held by Great Britain." The report then proceeded to paint a glowing picture of the freedom and prosperity of these provinces, especially of the Maritimes, stressing among other things their progress in railway development. There was, it felt, an "entire want of motive in the people of these Provinces for any change in their political system—such as the proposed confederation. They need only the markets of the United States to become rich, prosperous and powerful. The market of Canada is of no more value to them than that of Vancouver, or the West India Islands."

Confederation itself was then given adverse attention. It was part of a plan "originating in the cupidity of that enemy of republican institutions, Lord Palmerston, and his chosen ally, the Emperor of France." It was set on foot to extirpate free institutions from the American soil, and to supplant them with monarchical governments. While Napoleon, in control of Mexico, became an ally of the Southern Confederacy, "a new power was to be created in North America by the confederation of the British North American Provinces, placed under the kingly rule of a scion of the house of Hanover, to form the nucleus of a new order of government for the Northern States."

The triumph of the North had foiled the plans of Napoleon, but the successors of Lord Palmerston, who, "while sharing his hatred

[2]*Ibid.*, Senate Document no. 87.

of republican institutions, lack his audacity," were engaged in forcing upon the British North American provinces a form of government, without a single movement in its favour among the people of British North America. Against their known opinions and wishes, an attempt was being made to secure their assent to an Imperial law that placed the people of the Lower Provinces at the mercy of the Canadian politicians.

If the people of the British provinces were allowed to vote on Confederation, and would agree to it, this would be quite satisfactory, since they could, of course, alter, amend, and change their government at pleasure. They were to be given no such liberty. The committee felt, therefore, that such an invasion of the rights of the people of British North America, made against their wishes and in the interest of monarchical government, was as clear a violation of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine as the invasion of Mexico by Imperial France.

The people of Maine, by reason of their position and their intimate commercial and social intercourse with the people of British North America, could not but respond to the suggestions of His Excellency the Governor. That did not mean advocating annexation. All such thoughts were discarded. The British North American provinces "must enjoy without interference on our part that form of government most congenial to the tastes, habits and interests of their people, in the assurance that nothing but friendly relations can grow out of the existing state of things."

In view of the situation outlined in the report, the committee then offered three resolutions:

> That any attempt on the part of the imperial government of Great Britain to establish monarchical governments in North America, or to place a vice-royalty by act of parliament over her several North American provinces, would be an implied infraction of those principles of government which this nation has assumed to maintain upon this continent.
>
> That the people of Maine, deeply interested in the preservation of peace and of friendly relations with the people of British North America, respectfully appeal to the United States government to interpose its legitimate influence in friendly and earnest remonstrance with the British government against establishing any system of government in North America, the influence of which would endanger the friendly relations of the people of the British provinces with the people of the United States.
>
> That the governor be requested to transmit copies of the foregoing report and resolves to the president of the United States and to each house of congress.

With the presentation and acceptance of this committee report, the direct action of the Maine Legislature in the Confederation question

ceased. There were indirect results for some time thereafter, both in the United States and in Canada.

Maine's effort to halt Confederation merged with and contributed to the wider congressional agitation on that subject, an agitation increased by the rumour that the new union was to be called a kingdom.[3] At the same time as the Maine resolutions came the first of three anti-Confederation moves in Congress. On February 27, Representative Raymond of New York asked that the President be requested to inform the House "whether any remonstrance has been made by this Government against the proposed consolidation of all the British North American Provinces into a single confederation under the imperial rule of an English prince."[4]

On March 8, Representative Banks, a Radical Republican who had earlier demanded the outright annexation of Canada, urged the immediate appointment of the Committee on Foreign Relations by the newly assembled Fortieth Congress, "in view of events transpiring on the northern frontier of the United States."[5] These events, Banks explained, came from the passage through the House of Lords of the bill providing for a confederation of the British provinces, and contemplating "the foundation of a State or an empire that may hereafter surpass in power that of England, and equal that of the United States; or, as was said by its mover, 'be second only to that of Russia.' " To emphasize the danger, he then had read to the House the report on the subject by the Legislature of Maine, the state most interested in Confederation. Although not all the representatives were convinced of the need of immediate action, Blaine of Maine being, rather surprisingly, among the dissenters, Banks won his point, and the committee was forthwith appointed. The congressional discussion of Confederation ended on March 27 when the Joint Committee

[3] Although the possibility that Canada would be officially styled a kingdom had been considered before, much of the adverse press reaction in the United States during the spring of 1867 seems to have been caused by a piece of journalistic enterprise on the part of the Toronto *Globe*. The *Globe* on February 25, 1867 printed a preliminary draft of the British North America Bill containing the designation "Kingdom." The final version, with "Dominion," was published on March 1, but the indignation caused in the United States at the thought of a kingdom on their northern frontier did not subside for some time. See Montreal *Gazette*, Feb. 27, March 1, 1867; Toronto *Leader*, March 1, 1867; *New York Times*, Feb. 26, March 6, March 11, 1867; *Portland Daily Press*, March 4, 1867; *Portland Evening Star*, March 4, 1867; *Bangor Daily Whig and Courier*, March 11, 1867.

[4] *Congressional Globe*, 2nd Sess., 39th Congress, 1617. For a discussion of the congressional action on Canadian Confederation see L. B. Shippee, *Canadian-American Relations, 1849–1874* (New Haven, 1939), 196, 197.

[5] *Congressional Globe*, 1st Sess., 40th Congress, 37.

on Foreign Relations reported out and had accepted a resolution which echoed in many respects that of the Maine Legislature. The resolution declared:

> . . . the people of the United States cannot regard the proposed confederation of the Provinces on the Northern frontier of this country without extreme solicitude; that a confederation of States on this continent, extending from ocean to ocean, established without consulting the people of the Provinces to be united, and founded upon monarchical principles, cannot be considered otherwise than in contravention of the traditions and constantly declared principles of this Government, endangering its most important interests and tending to increase and perpetuate embarrassments already existing between the two Governments immediately interested.[6]

Meanwhile, anti-Confederation sentiment in Congress and in the American press had excited alarm in England and indignation in Canada. Sir Frederick Bruce, the British Ambassador in Washington, had kept his Government fully informed of the opposition as it developed, stressing particularly the apprehensions aroused by the term "Kingdom."[7] Of this the Foreign Secretary took a view sufficiently serious to cause him to urge the substitution of some less controversial term in the bill establishing the Canadian Confederation. Over the opposition of the Canadian delegates, the "Kingdom" then became a "Dominion."

The Canadian press reacted in a more belligerent fashion both to the Maine resolutions and to those of Congress. The Montreal *Gazette* had characterized Governor Chamberlain's original reference to Confederation as a "gross impropriety";[8] it saw in the Maine legislative report "a remarkable affectation of historical learning and ignorance of the constitutional relations of the people of these colonies to the measure of Confederation now before the Imperial Parliament."[9]

The Toronto *Globe*, which had called the Raymond resolution of February 27 "anti-British buncombe,"[10] on March 9 devoted a long editorial to "Maine Impudence." The assurance of the Maine Legislature in assuming to define the principles on which the whole continent should be governed was really sublime. "It reminds one of

[6] *Ibid.*, 392.

[7] Public Record Office, London, F.O. 5, 1106, Bruce to Stanley, no. 77, March 2, 1867; *ibid.*, Bruce to Stanley, no. 100, March 30, 1867; C.O. 42, 662, Michel to Buckingham, confidential, April 4, 1867.

[8] Montreal *Gazette*, Jan. 9, 1867. The *St. Croix Courier* felt that Governor Chamberlain was "meddling with a matter which does not come within the range of his official duty." Quoted in the *Eastport Sentinel*, Jan. 23, 1867.

[9] Montreal *Gazette*, March 9, 1867.

[10] Toronto *Globe*, March 1, 1867.

the naked chief in the interior of Africa who daily caused a horn to be blown and a small drum to be rattled after he had finished his imperial repast of milk and elephant's meat, to notify the sovereigns of the rest of the earth that they were now at liberty to dine, since his Sable Majesty had refreshed himself." The *Globe* then proceeded to point out with gusto what it regarded as inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the report. The British North American provinces were quite happy under their present rule. "There is not one man in a thousand among us, who has the slightest desire to appeal to King Andrew the First against the sway of Queen Victoria." The Maine Senate might be better occupied with helping to solve some of the urgent problems that confronted their own nation.

The *Globe's* concluding remarks suggest some interesting questions. Just why did the Maine Legislature inject itself into what might with some justification be regarded as a federal matter, in any case, hardly its concern? Was it in response to widespread public indignation against the unification of the British North American provinces? Or were more specialized interests behind Governor Chamberlain's original statement and the Legislature's response? The fragmentary nature of the sources for the period makes it somewhat difficult to go behind the report itself for the answers to these questions, but the existing evidence indicates that an interpretation of the Maine anti-Confederation move rather different from the official version is possible.

There is little doubt that there was in Maine at this time much anti-British and some anti-Canadian feeling. To tales of British raids in the American Revolution and the War of 1812, and of the British occupation of the state from the Penobscot east in 1814,[11] had been added more recent wrongs. Border disputes culminating in the "Aroostook War" were still a vivid and, in some parts of the state, a bitter memory. The Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842 had settled the boundary, but it had left in Maine a belief that neither the British nor the American Government had done justice to her claims.[12] Maine had, moreover, shared the general ill will engendered

[11]Public opinion in Maine, as elsewhere in New England, was divided during the War of 1812. Some Maine towns refused support to the war, and the eastern section of the state submitted to British occupation with little overt resistance. L. C. Hatch, *A History of Maine* (New York, 1919), I, 72; F. F. Beirne, *The War of 1812* (New York, 1949), 291; Harold Davis, *The International Community of the St. Croix* (Orono, Me., 1950), 109.

[12]H. S. Burrage, *Maine in the Northeastern Boundary Controversy* (Portland, 1919), chap. xx. See also David Lowenthal, "The Maine Press and the Aroostook War," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXXII, Dec., 1951, 315–56.

in the North by England's attitude during the Civil War. The Trent affair had brought home to the state her exposed geographical position and the deficiencies both of her coastal and her border defences.[13] Her apprehensions were increased by Confederate border raids, a topic to which eastern Maine newspapers referred with acrimony when Fenian activities later roused similar fears in New Brunswick.[14]

If political and military factors provided some sources of friction, economic rivalries created others. Maine lumber and fishing interests were among the most vocal opponents of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. Maine's Senator William Pitt Fessenden, who voted for the treaty, wrote a friend at the time that when Congress adjourned he would be the most unpopular man in the state, since his vote would "enrage all 'Down East' on account of admitting lumber duty free."[15] Maine went officially on record against the treaty in 1862 with a legislative resolution that "it is the duty of the national government of the United States to give notice to the British government, that the reciprocity treaty so-called, will be rescinded on the part of the United States at the expiration of the time to which its operation is limited by its terms. . . ."[16]

It was from her economic connections with the British North American provinces, however, that there came some of the friendlier aspects of the relations between Maine and her northern neighbours. There had long been a lucrative trade between New England and the Maritimes, a trade that even wars did not interrupt. The Reciprocity Treaty found support as well as opposition in Maine. Some of her citizens felt, with the *Maine Farmer*, that the treaty was "a regulator to meet the common wants of the people, so that when

[13]When Secretary of State Seward in January, 1862 gave permission for British troops to land in Portland and proceed to Canada over the Grand Trunk Railway, the Maine Legislature objected strenuously, asking Seward officially whether "any steps have been taken to prevent such use of American soil within the limits of the State of Maine." Seward sent a conciliatory reply pointing out that this was only a usual international courtesy between countries not at war. The British finally decided against sending the troops over the Grand Trunk. *Maine Legislative Documents*, 1862, Senate Document no. 6; Hatch, *History of Maine*, II, 444, 491, 492.

[14]*Eastport Sentinel*, Dec. 13, 1865, April 4, 1866; *Machias Union*, Dec. 26, 1865.

[15]Francis Fessenden, *Life and Public Services of William Pitt Fessenden* (Boston, 1907), I, 48.

[16]*Laws of Maine*, 1862, c. 171. A similar resolution was passed in 1865, *ibid.*, 1865, c. 373. One of the eastern Maine newspapers, rejoicing at the end of the Reciprocity Treaty, expressed the opinion that the people of Maine, except for those around Portland, had opposed its renewal. *Machias Union*, Feb. 6, 1866. For further details of the Maine reaction to reciprocity see Shippee, *Canadian-American Relations*, 57, 290; Davis, *International Community of the St. Croix*, 235, and J. K. Chapman, "Relations of Maine and New Brunswick in the Era of Reciprocity, 1849–1867" (M.A. thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1951), chaps. I, IV.

there is a deficiency on one side, there should be a supply at hand on the other."[17] The Portland Board of Trade asked that the treaty be continued and extended to include manufactures.[18] This desire for trade with Canada was intensified in the late 1850's by the construction of the Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railway between Portland and Montreal, to be followed in the 1860's by the still more ambitious European and North American Railway which would provide, at the very least, a close link between Maine and the Maritimes.[19]

The historical background of Maine-Canadian relations, therefore, was one of occasional periods of hostile feeling, relieved by the steady growth of closer economic ties. Clues to the immediate reaction of Maine to Canadian Confederation may be gained from the Maine press. Until early in 1867 there seems to have been only occasional comment on the constitutional changes projected in British North America. Even then discussion was largely confined to the few papers of fairly wide circulation in the state. An examination of these newspapers reveals the rather surprising fact that many of the Republican newspapers, as well as those normally Democratic, opposed the stand of Governor Chamberlain.

The Portland *Eastern Argus,* the state's leading Democratic newspaper, found the Governor's suggestion that Canadian Confederation was a violation of the Monroe Doctrine "simply ridiculous."[20] It felt that Maine had no right to interfere in the matter. "To speak plainly, it is none of our business. These colonies have the indefeasible right to make a confederation or a consolidated monarchy if they choose, without asking leave of us." The Republican *Portland Press* thought that Confederation was not "in any degree so objectionable to this country as the French invasion of Mexico."[21] The *Portland Transcript,* which otherwise approved the Governor's message, felt that he gave too much importance to this matter, and "in recommending intervention is going somewhat beyond our rights."[22]

The inaccurate report that Canada was to be called a kingdom

[17] *Maine Farmer,* Feb. 15, 1866.

[18] *Senate Misc. Documents,* 2nd Sess., 35th Congress, no. 44.

[19] A good recent summary of this railway development is E. C. Kirkland, *Men, Cities, and Transportation: A Study in New England History, 1820–1900* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948), I, 206–12, 218–22, 470–6. See also E. E. Chase, *Maine Railroads* (Portland, Me., 1926) chaps. II, VII, and G. P. deT. Glazebrook, *A History of Transportation in Canada* (Toronto, 1938), 156–64.

[20] Portland *Daily Eastern Argus,* Jan. 5, 1867.

[21] *Portland Daily Press,* Jan. 4, 1867.

[22] *Portland Transcript,* Jan. 12, 1867. The *Brunswick Telegraph,* an early supporter of Chamberlain, saw in the Governor's suggestion a resemblance to "the fight of Don Quixote with the windmill." Jan. 11, 1867.

caused a brief flurry in Maine. The *Portland Press* thought that the new government would be "an expensive luxury,"[23] and mentioned the rumour that the viceroy would be the second son of Queen Victoria. The *Bangor Daily Whig and Courier* reprinted with approval an article in the *Providence Journal* which expressed the view that any such kingdom was not a matter of particular concern to the United States, since it was after all only a more complete organization into a single state of a people now distributed among different provinces.[24] The *Portland Evening Star* was slightly confused. " . . . this union of the British Provinces, although we have heard so much about it for two years past, is, and must be a sort of myth. . . . It matters little whether it is called the United Provinces, Kingdom or Dominion of Canada, since it is not to have a distinctive rule. Canada will know something has happened, but will not so readily understand what."[25] The *Eastern Argus* closed the discussion with an editorial deploring the whole misunderstanding as a "ludicrous farce."[26]

The major exception to the general attitude of indifference to or cautious approval of Canadian Confederation was the *Kennebec Journal*, a fact indicative less of public than of official reaction, since the *Journal*, called by one newspaper an "organ" of Governor Chamberlain,[27] was very close to the state Government. On January 25 the *Journal* reprinted from the *Detroit Post* an attack on Confederation by a French-Canadian correspondent who saw in it a movement "inimical to the United States." On February 22, less than a week before the report on Confederation to the Maine Legislature—and before the news that Canada was to be called a kingdom had reached the United States—there appeared in the *Journal* a long and hostile editorial on the union of the British provinces. With M. Cadieux of the *Detroit Post*, the *Journal* felt that "there cannot be a shade of doubt that the real tendency of the scheme for the confederation of the Canadas, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia is

[23]*Portland Daily Press*, March 4, 1867.

[24]*Bangor Daily Whig and Courier*, March 11, 1867.

[25]*Portland Evening Star*, March 4, 1867.

[26]Portland *Daily Eastern Argus*, March 29, 1867. The *Eastport Sentinel*, which followed Canadian news more closely than most Maine newspapers, did not take an editorial stand on Maine's legislative action against Confederation. It had gone on record earlier, however, as approving the union of the British provinces, though only as an alternative to annexation to the United States, *Eastport Sentinel*, Oct. 4, 1865.

[27]Portland *Daily Eastern Argus*, Feb. 27, 1867. From 1854 to 1857 the *Kennebec Journal* was owned and edited by James G. Blaine. Joint editor and publisher after 1856 was John L. Stevens, who in 1867 was chief editor. Stevens was a member of the Maine legislative committee which issued the anti-Confederation report.

inimical to the interests of the United States, and especially so to Maine." This was the result of a long-conceived plot, going back at least to the Durham *Report*, to provide a counterpoise against the United States in war and peace alike. The *Journal* could and did quote from such Confederation leaders as Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George Cartier, and Sir Charles Tupper, to prove that hostility to the United States was a powerful motive in the decision to unite the British North American provinces. If carried into effect, Confederation would tend "to embroil the relations of the Northern States of the Union with their neighbors and must greatly increase the expenses of our Government in guarding against the dangers of attack on the frontiers and coasts."

Maine was interested in a special degree. Its great length of sea-coast on the south and its extended frontier on the north, exposed to British naval attacks on the one side and to the invasion of British land forces on the other, meant that in case of war Maine would have to stand the terrible cross-fire of the combined power of the enemy. This danger Governor Chamberlain had seen. Some thought his remarks were premature and uncalled for, but the fact remained that "the inevitable tendency of it [Confederation] is prejudicial to the future union of the British Provinces with the United States. . . . If it be proper for our government to remonstrate against the establishment of French ideas and schemes in Mexico, it cannot be less proper to have an eye on British plans of domination at the North of us."

From the press reaction to official statements against Canadian Confederation, there may be drawn the conclusion that they did not have any very strong public support. The state Government's decision to go ahead with its protest in spite of the general apathy or hostility revealed after the remarks in the Governor's message may be due in part, at least, to the political complexion of the Maine Government and in part to the operation of forces whose nature is indicated by the authorship of the legislative report.

Maine's Governor in 1867, Joshua L. Chamberlain, had been elected largely on his record as a Civil War general.[28] He would, therefore, be especially responsive to the argument that Canadian Confederation was a menace to the future safety of the United States as a whole and to Maine in particular. His political supporters

[28]A Republican newspaper which had supported one of Chamberlain's rivals for the gubernatorial nomination remarked that the General, a hero of the battle of Gettysburg, had never had "a day's experience in political affairs." *Portland Daily Press*, quoted in Hatch, *History of Maine*, II, 533.

had close ties with the Radical Republicans in Congress, and, as the rather revealing article in the Kennebec *Journal* indicates, he sympathized with the annexationist ideas of that group.[29]

The background of the legislative report itself is more enlightening. Ostensibly it was the work of a joint committee of the Legislature in which appear the names of such of Maine's future political leaders as Eugene Hale and William P. Frye. Actually it was written by the state's leading railway magnate, John A. Poor, the chief exponent both of the Atlantic and St. Lawrence and the European and North American railways. As early as October, 1866, Poor was sending advice—and railway pamphlets—to the newly elected Governor, whom he did not as yet know personally.[30] By January, 1867, he was ready with detailed suggestions on the implementation of the Governor's message.[31] On January 24, at the Governor's request, Poor sent a long statement of his views on the significance of Confederation, in which "I cannot doubt your full concurrence," even though "I am aware that the unthinking mass of our countrymen, even in New England, are inclined to treat the suggestions of your Message on Confederation, as an unwise interference with national topics. . . ."[32]

Poor was justified in his confidence. The final report and the resolutions of the Maine Legislature are, with some minor changes in wording, almost identical with his enclosed memorandum. His biographer can with accuracy include this report as one of his published works.[33]

There remains the question of why John A. Poor, whose knowledge of Canada and Canadians was probably unsurpassed in the state, should have taken so uncompromising a stand against Confederation. His surviving papers indicate that the answer may be found in the relation of events in Canada to the dominating interest of Poor's life, railroads.

Poor's reactions toward Canada in the years before Confederation seem to have ranged from feelings of suspicion and distrust to those

[29] *Ibid.* The *Kennebec Journal* had in 1866 seen in the Confederation of the British North American provinces an effort "to prevent the gradual growth among them of a disposition to favor annexation to the great republic." *Kennebec Journal,* July 6, 1866.

[30] Library of the Maine Historical Society, John A. Poor Papers, Poor to Chamberlain, Oct. 8, 1866.

[31] *Ibid.,* Poor to Chamberlain, Jan. 8, 1867.

[32] *Ibid.,* Poor to Chamberlain, Jan. 24, 1867, memorandum enclosed.

[33] L. E. Poor, *The First International Railway: Life and Writings of John Alfred Poor* (New York, 1892), 140, 141. See also J. A. Williamson, *A Bibliography of the State of Maine from the Earliest Period to 1891* (Portland, Me., 1896), II, 273.

of cordial friendship. As a young lawyer in Bangor, he had followed with an intensely partisan interest the boundary dispute which was finally resolved by the Webster-Ashburton Treaty. He shared with many other residents of Maine the feeling that in that settlement both the British Government and his own had been unfair to the state. In his opinion, "the title of Maine to the entire territory claimed by her, was clear and indisputable."[34]

By 1850 closer contacts with the British North American provinces, and the need for co-operation in the building of the Atlantic and St. Lawrence Railway, had brought a considerable change in Poor's attitude toward Canada. When business and government leaders of New England and the Maritimes met in Portland in the summer of that year to inaugurate the project of the European and North American Railway, they did so in an atmosphere of great cordiality. The tone was set by the invitation to the conference.

> The spirit of peace has at last prevailed—national animosities, sectional and political hostility, have disappeared between the English races, since the establishment of the boundaries of Maine and Oregon, and the contests of war have been succeeded by a noble and generous rivalry for the promotion of the arts of peace. The introduction of the steamship and the railway has made former enemies friends, and the citizens of Montreal and Portland, of Halifax and Boston, of St. John and New York, are to all intents and purposes one people, speaking a common language and struggling for the same destiny. National hostility has given way to commercial and social intercourse, and under whatever government they may hereafter exist, they can never again become hostile, or unfriendly.[35]

In view of the close tie between international commerce and international railways, it is not surprising to find John A. Poor an early and enthusiastic advocate of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and, ultimately, of commercial union between the United States and Canada. His sentiments on the subject are implied in the invitation to the Portland Convention of 1850. They are set forth in the 1859 petition of the Portland Board of Trade, which he wrote at the request of the board,[36] and they are stated emphatically in a letter to John A. Macdonald in 1860. After expressing his fears that Congress would repeal or terminate the Reciprocity Treaty, Poor said: "It is all important that the country should realize the necessity of

[34]J. A. Poor, *Maine as a Field for Immigration* (Augusta, 1861), 6. Poor wrote three letters to the *Portland Advertiser* on the northeast boundary controversy, and similar accounts occur in most of his historical summaries of British-American relations. L. E. Poor, *First International Railway*, 20.

[35]Poor Papers, Circular Invitation to the Portland Railroad Convention of 1850. This invitation is also printed in L. E. Poor, *First International Railway*, 172–5.

[36]*Ibid.*, 74.

its being continued as the fixed policy of the two countries. This agitation of the question of repeal of the measure affects injuriously, already, private interests and cannot fail to touch those of all the British North American colonies. . . ."[37] In a message to the Chicago Ship-Canal Convention in 1863, he went even further. "The *English-speaking people* of this continent are, for all commercial purposes, *one people*, holding a territory twice the size of the continent of Europe, capable of sustaining as dense a population as that which now occupies that favored portion of the globe."[38]

There is also evidence that, in private, Poor had by the early 1860's reached the conclusion that political union must and would go along with commercial union. The Civil War and its accompanying international tensions brought together his railway interests and his intense state patriotism. In 1861, when Maine began to look to her coastal and border defences, Poor went to Washington as one of three commissioners sent to obtain federal aid for the strengthening of the northeast frontier against a possible British attack.[39] Fairly early in the negotiations it became apparent that, in the opinion of the commissioners, the frontier could be adequately defended only by a military railroad from Bangor to the St. John River.[40] One of Poor's special projects, pursued at intervals from 1862 to 1866, was to convince Congress that substantial assistance to the European and North American Railroad would provide that military road.[41] The victory of the North in the Civil War made the possibility of immediate British invasion seem somewhat remote; Poor could and did substitute the spectre of the creation, in a Canadian confederation, of a rival—and monarchical—power on the North American continent.

As a part of the initial campaign to obtain federal funds for Maine's defences, Poor wrote a long letter to Secretary of War Stanton. In it he outlined the commission's case, pointed out the dangers of Britain's attitude, and of her future plans for the British North American provinces. He also suggested steps which could be taken to guard against them.

[37]P.A.C., Macdonald Papers, vol. 337, Poor to Macdonald, private, Dec. 6, 1860. Macdonald's cautiously worded reply could not have been too reassuring. He affirmed his belief in the importance of continuing the treaty, but did not see that Canada could do much except negotiate for its continuance and, perhaps, its extension. *Ibid.*, vol. 508, Macdonald to Poor, Jan. 2, 1861.

[38]"An American Zoll-Verein," in L. E. Poor, *First International Railway*, 213.

[39]Hatch, *History of Maine*, II, 49; L. E. Poor, *First International Railway*, 80.

[40]*Maine Legislative Documents*, 1863, House Document no. 1, 22.

[41]Kirkland, *Men, Cities, and Transportation*, I, 470, 471; L. E. Poor, *First International Railway*, 82–6.

It is useless longer to disguise our fears that the British Government will, at an early day, demand the opening of the ports of the cotton States, or in some other method, involve the two nations in a war. Her governing classes have no sympathy with our peculiar form of government, and her commercial enterprise finds in us, already, a formidable rival. . . . Her assailable point is her North American possessions. These taken from her, our commercial and political importance would be increased to the extent she is weakened thereby. The people of these colonies, like our own in their social habits and tastes, are more in sympathy with our institutions, than with those of the old world. . . . a change from their institutions to ours would produce very little shock of their social system.[42]

This picture of a dangerously hostile Britain and of provinces whose annexation would not only strengthen the United States and forestall the dangers of a confederation, but could be undertaken with relatively little opposition, was repeated in 1866 when Poor at last had an opportunity to present his case before a joint meeting of the House and Senate Foreign Relations committees. In answer to an inquiry from Senator Sumner as to why the European and North American was more a military necessity than any other railroad, Poor reminded the committee that in case of a war with Great Britain, Maine might well be the first point at which the enemy would attack.[43] He also expressed his feeling that the proposed federation of the British provinces was no other than a military measure. There was no natural connection between the interior and the Maritime provinces. These last were socially, economically, and geographically much closer to the United States. Moreover, "The principles of our Constitution are of universal application, and our Government is capable of indefinite expansion. It must gradually cover the continent, or at any rate all portions of it, where the people speak a common language."[44]

Before he wrote the more cautiously worded memorandum which became the basis of Maine's anti-Confederation statement, Poor had thus reached a position very like that of the congressional annexationists. It is probable that he would in any case have opposed Canadian Confederation, if only because it threatened to reduce the

[42]*Maine Legislative Documents*, 1863, House Document no. 1, 24, 25, Poor to Edward M. Stanton, Jan. 31, 1862.

[43]Poor Papers, Hearing before a Joint Committee [of the] Senate & House on Foreign Relations in relation to the E[uropean] & N[orth] A[merican] R[ailway], Washington, May 1, 1866. This document consists of a newspaper clipping of the hearing, no name or date given, supplemented by a hand-written report of the testimony. According to the newspaper account, the House delegations of Maine and Massachusetts were present. Senator Charles Sumner presided.

[44]Poor Papers. On the document is written "Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations in relation to the E & N A R W, written by Mr. Poor, 1866, Washington. Has never been published."

volume of trade upon which the success of the European and North American Railway would depend. There is also the possibility that he was influenced by the anti-Confederation movement in New Brunswick, and that the Maine resolution of 1867 represents a belated effort to prevent a union which would alter the economic orientation of the Maritimes.

The evidence on this point is somewhat contradictory. The identification of the anti-Confederationists of New Brunswick with those who favoured the completion of the European and North American Railway and closer ties with New England over the Intercolonial and union with Canada is generally accepted.[45] Poor himself seems to have shared this belief. Among the clippings preserved in his scrapbook is an editorial from the Portland *Eastern Argus* of March 8, 1865, commenting on the outcome of the New Brunswick election. The *Argus* remarked: "It seems to be conceded that the defeat of confederation carries with it the defeat of the intercolonial railway designed to connect the provinces wholly through British territory. If this be so, it may perhaps give impetus to the construction of the European & North American Railway, connecting Maine with New Brunswick and the lower British provinces, in which our State is largely interested."[46]

A stronger indication that Poor regarded the New Brunswick anti-Confederationists as more favourable towards his railway than their opponents was his arrival in Saint John as promptly as possible after their victory in the election of 1865 to assist in getting government support for the project. His biographer's description of the visit and its motivation may well represent his own opinion.

> . . . we may briefly say, that the Halifax and Quebec, that is, the Intercolonial plan, was offered incessantly to New Brunswick instead of the European and North American Railway, the International and Commercial plan. New Brunswick had steadily opposed the confederation of all British North America, year after year, and had steadily clung to the Commercial Railway. Mr. Poor had kept up communication with the New Brunswick politicians ever since the Portland Convention. In February, 1865, a strong anti-confederation government had been formed; as soon as the business was settled with the Massachusetts Legislature, Mr. Poor hastened to St. John, in June, 1865. Fortunately, for the anti-confederation party was turned out of power in 1866, a strong confedera-

[45]See A. G. Bailey, "Railways and the Confederation Issue in New Brunswick, 1863–1865," *Canadian Historical Review*, XXI, Dec., 1940, 368, and "The Basis and Persistence of Opposition to Confederation in New Brunswick," *ibid.*, XXIII, March, 1942, 382.

[46]Library of the Maine Historical Society, John A. Poor Scrapbook; Portland *Daily Eastern Argus*, March 8, 1865.

tion party came in, who would have opposed the European and North American Railway.[47]

Laura Poor's interpretation of the relative positions of the two major political groups in New Brunswick at the time was not altogether accurate. Support for "western extension" could be found among pro- as well as anti-Confederationists. Poor's closest associate in New Brunswick, Charles N. Skinner, was defeated in 1865 and elected in 1866 as a Confederation candidate to the New Brunswick Legislature from the county of St. John.[48] Skinner's enthusiasm for the European and North American, however, seems to have been considerably greater than his zeal for Confederation. With some of the other directors of the New Brunswick Company, he gave active assistance in raising funds for the Maine end of the line, and he accompanied Poor to Washington to give testimony before the Congressional Foreign Relations Committee on behalf of a railway which was still being presented as a defence project. In his remarks at the hearing, the New Brunswick legislator stressed the desire existing in the Maritimes for more trade and closer friendship with the United States.

> While we may there have feelings of nationality among our people, and differences about the intercolonial railroad, there is a very strong commercial interest and feeling developing in the Maritime provinces to have their trade connect where it naturally belongs, with the U.S.; and this railroad of ours is a sort of iron band to keep that trade in its natural position, and link the two countries commercially together. . . . If we had been one people, and there had been no difference of nationality between us, this road would probably have been pushed forward before.[49]

The text of the Maine legislative resolution itself indicates that, if its author derived inspiration from New Brunswick, it was from the anti-Confederation group. The picture drawn in the report of a peaceful, prosperous, and contented people, forced by an iron-handed Imperial Government into an unwanted union, might well

[47]L. E. Poor, *First International Railway*, 86. Laura Poor was John A. Poor's daughter.

[48]James Hannay, *History of New Brunswick* (Saint John, N.B., 1909), II, 231, 250. Samuel Leonard Tilley, leader of the Confederation forces, presented himself to the voters in 1865 as "a firm friend of Western Extension," but he wrote Alexander Galt that "the friends of Western Extension . . . are mostly the enemies of confederation." See *Saint John Daily News*, Feb. 3, 1865; Macdonald Papers, vol. 51, Tilley to Galt, March, 1865, and Chapman, "Maine and New Brunswick in the Era of Reciprocity," 117–27.

[49]Poor Papers, Hearing before a Joint Committee of the Senate and House on Foreign Relations in relation to the European and North American Railway, May 1, 1866.

have come from the pen of a Maritime anti-Confederationist. Poor's annexationist ideas are expressed in the report only by indirection. However anti-British in tone, the report was not really anti-Canadian. In the end it did little more than augment an agitation which caused concern in England and greater tension in the already somewhat strained relations between the United States and Canada. The anxiety of Maine—and of John A. Poor—about the political future of British North America does present additional evidence of the close link between railroads and international politics in the period.

THE FALL OF QUEBEC

THE following extract, taken from the *Belfast News-Letter and General Advertiser,* No. 2320, Tuesday, November 6, 1759, was sent to us by Professor C. R. Fay, who came across it while going through the files of this newspaper. [Eds.]

Extract of a letter from an officer at Quebeck to his friend, dated Sept. 20

Dear Sir, I have pleasure of writing this in the capital city of America, of which our troops took possession the 18th. inst. at four o'clock in the afternoon. This was the consequence of a compleat victory obtained over the forces of France, consisting of about 3000 regulars and not less than 7000 Canadians and Indians, the 13th. inst. near the citadel of Quebec: our forces did not amount to 5000. This little battle was one of the most glorious that ever was fought; great pity that our brave gen. Wolfe did not survive it! he was killed in the beginning of the action, and gen. Montcalm was so much wounded that he died the same night. Our second in command, gen. Monckton, was wounded; and the general that succeeded Montcalm was killed. It will perhaps be some satisfaction to you to give you some account of the steps that were taken previous to this famous engagement, which has determined the fate of Canada.

We had three camps; one on the east side of the fall of Montmorency, one on the west point of the island of Orleans, and one on Point Levy. That on Montmorency was the grand one, where the generals Wolfe and Townshend commanded. That on Point Levy was the next most considerable and commanded by gen. Monckton; and that on Orleans was commanded always by some colonel: on Point Levy was a very strong battery of cannon and mortars, which played night and day upon the city, and did considerable damage. The fleet was stationed as follows: Admirals Saunders and Holmes, with several ships of war & transports, between Point Levy and the west points of Orleans; Admiral Durell, with several men of war and transports, between the east point of Orleans and Isle Madam. Besides these, there were two or three ships at the isle of Coudre, and one at the isle of Beke, and some others in other parts of the river, particularly the Sutherland has been for a considerable time several leagues up the river above Quebec, and was the first ship that past the batteries of the city; a thing that one would think impossible; but at last our frigates, and even transports, thought little of it, and several have gone up since, and very few hurt.

This was the situation of our army and navy the 2nd. of this month, when our camp at Montmorency broke up, having first destroyed all the country on that side as far down as Coudre, without being in the least molested by the French, except their throwing a few shells among the boats, which however

Vol. XXXIII, no. 2, June, 1952

did no damage, and they arrived all safe at Point Levy; from whence all the troops marched the 6th. inst leaving here about 700 men; but whether they intended to cross the river and get above the town, or whether it was intended to open a communication with gen. Amherst, remained a secret: the public orders of the 12th, which was the last given out by brave gen. Wolfe, gave the troops to understand what they were going upon; I think they were excellent, and will therefore give you a copy of them as follows.

On board the Sutherland, Wednesday, the 12th. of September 1759.

"The enemy's forces are now divided, great scarcity of provisions in their camp, and universal discontent among the Canadians.

"The second officer in command is gone to Montreal or St. John's, which gives reason to think that gen. Amherst is advancing into the colony.

"A vigorous blow struck by the army may determine the fate of Canada. Our troops below (at Point Levy and Orleans) are in readiness to join us; and all the light artillery and tools are embarked at Point Levy; and the troops will land where the French seem least to expect it.

"The first body that gets on shore are to march directly to the enemy, and drive them from any little post they may occupy. The officers must take care that the succeeding bodies do not, by any mistake fire upon them that go before them.

"The battalions must form upon the upper ground with expedition and be ready to charge whatever presents itself.

"When the artillery and troops are landed, a corps will be left to secure the landing place, while the rest march on and endeavour to bring the French and Canadians to battle.

"The officers and men will remember what their country expects from them, and what a determined body of soldiers are capable of doing against five weak French battalions mingled with disorderly peasantry.

"The soldiers must be attentive and obedient to their officers, and resolute in the execution of their duty."

Besides the above there were some others regarding the regulation of the boats, which are not material.

These orders being given out, the ships and boats were ordered up the river with the tide; upon which Montcalm ordered out a large body to attend their motions, but Wolfe, upon the turn of the tide, which happened late in the night, sailed down the river, and before day light landed almost under the wall of Quebec, in a place where indeed nobody could expect it; in short they had a hill almost perpendicular to climb up, which however the troops effected, and gain'd the upper ground, where they were entertained with continual popping shots from parties of the French and Canadians, in order to keep our people in play till their forces from their several encampments between the Fall of Montmorency and Quebec could be brought to their assistance.

On the other hand our people had the same occasion to keep them in play till our forces could be collected and formed on the top of the hill. This sort of fighting continued till after ten o'clock when both armies were formed; and then the French advanced towards ours in three columns with a very good countenance, and looked as if they were determined to fight in reality, ours were drawn up in two lines, and were ordered to keep up their fire, and receive that of the French which was accordingly done, and then our people got so

near them as to make them feel our bullets and bayonets at the same time. The fire continued very hot indeed for about the space of ten minutes, when the French and Canadians turned tail, then 450 Highlanders were let loose upon them with their broad swords, and made a terrible havock among the poor devils, as far as the walls of the city, which they would have entered with the runaways had they not been called back: one of their Captains told me that the French were in so great confusion and seized with so great a pannick that the gate might have been kept open by those handful of men till the rest of the army could have come up, and so have taken possession of the city by storm, and that would have certainly been the case had Gen. Wolfe lived; but his death threw a damp upon the whole army. When every thing is considered the surviving General acted prudently, for if they maintained the ground they were upon, the devil could not keep them out of the city in the course of a few days; whereas if they had attempted to storm or take possession of the city that day, an accident might have deprived them of the advantages and glory they had already won.

There was no more than the first line of our army engaged, the second line stood still, there being no occasion for it. It was one of the most regular battles that ever was fought; there were no entrenchments, no rivers, no banks, nor woods, to give one army advantage over another; Montcalm indeed had greater experience in the art of war, than Wolfe; but Wolfe was more brave and intrepid, than Montcalm.

As soon as the pursuit was over, the army set about casting up redoubts, and before night had finished about a dozen of them; that night our army lay upon their arms expecting a visit from the French next morning but they had enough of it, and therefore did not think proper to appear. The 14th., there was a flag of truce for burying. The 15th. & 16th. some hundred sailors were employed in drawing of cannon up a road where the troops landed; a laborious employment, which the honest Tars set about with the greatest alacrity: It was really diverting, to hear the midshipman cry out "Starboard, Starboard, my brave boys." The 17th. the French hung out their flag, and on the 18th. our troops took possession of the town.

The glory of this affair is due to brave Wolfe; for after the 13th. there was not one shot fired at the enemy. His body, I hear, is going to England in the Royal William, in order, I suppose to be interred in Westminster Abbey.

P.S. There were killed and taken of the enemy.

1 Lieutenant general, 2 brigadier generals, 2 colonels, killed—2 majors taken, 18 captains killed or taken, 50 odd subalterns, ditto. All French regulars.

In the whole there were at least 1800 men killed, wounded, and taken prisoners in the battle.

The French that were found in the city were granted the same terms as ours had in Minorca.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

An Introduction to Philosophy of History. By W. H. Walsh. London: Hutchinson's University Library [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1951. Pp. 173. $2.25.

This book, the author tells us, is primarily intended for philosophers, in the belief that English philosophers, in their distaste for philosophies of history written by German metaphysicians, have unduly neglected history, whilst admitting that "philosophy of science is a perfectly serious branch of study." Mr. Walsh, in the wake of Collingwood, asserts that philosophy of history has a like claim on their attention. But the book can claim to be of equal interest to historians, who are now forced to consider their subject in wider and more general terms, because of the increasing recognition of the value of the historical approach to problems of today, and also because of the ever widening range of historical studies. For history today is world history as never before, and must take into account cultural and economic as well as political aspects of human development. And writers such as Spengler and Croce, Collingwood and Toynbee, whether philosophers or historians, have in fact made contributions toward the philosophy of history which concern all students or writers of history. Mr. Walsh's book is of set purpose short, the work of a teacher of philosophy, plainly written, meaty, but comprehensible to the layman, including the historical student less acquainted with philosophical terminology and methods. There is an excellent brief note on "books for further reading." The only omission noted there (as in the text) is of any reference to Troeltsch.

The book is divided into two parts, the first and larger portion (chaps. I-V) concerned with a critique of the processes and problems of historical thought, the second (chaps. VI-VII) with philosophies of history from Kant onwards. This division Mr. Walsh sees as corresponding to that of the study of natural science, likewise divided into the critical analysis of scientific thinking, and the study of natural phenomena in the effort to explain Nature as a whole, "a speculative" process comparable to philosophies of history. So with natural science in mind he asks, how are historical knowledge and thinking related to the knowledge and thinking of science? What are historical truth and fact? Can history be objective? In answer to the first question he found that history does indeed go beyond chronicle, aiming at a "significant" narrative to explain *why* things happened as they did. But it falls short of a science since it is concerned with the particular and, though it may generalize within its topic, cannot achieve the laws, prediction, and application sought by science. Claims have indeed been made that history is (or could be) a science, first by the Positivists, and then by modern idealists such as Dilthey and Collingwood. But the author rightly refuses to follow Collingwood in his claim that historians could "by an intuitive act" re-think the thoughts behind past action, and so explain it. Rather he finds historical explanation to lie in seeing historical events in their context when they can be so "colligated," and likewise in a general knowledge of human nature and behaviour available from experience.

The question of historical truth is not to be solved by faith that truth is what "corresponds to the facts" as elicited from the evidence, even assuming that modern historians evaluate their evidence critically. For "facts" are less factual than we are inclined to think, involving some interpretation by the receiver. And truth to the philosopher may attain credence in one of two ways, either because it "corresponds" to the facts as "given," or because it fits in, "coheres," with other accepted statements. The argument is too close to be summarized here, but results in the author's attempt at a synthesis of the two views as applicable to history. Despite our inability to obtain (as Collingwood argued) a "direct view" of the past, some facts may, indeed *must*, be accepted, and others related to them in order to attain a coherent picture. But is this an "objective" picture? Mr. Walsh argues that in the selection of evidence (and sometimes of theme) there is of necessity judgment as to what is relevant and significant, and here an element of subjectivity comes in. And the historian must agree that this is true, even of such champions of impartiality as Ranke and Acton. Yet the author rightly goes on to allow that certain personal likes or dislikes, social prepossessions, may be consciously and sufficiently overcome. The real difficulty comes with differing theories of historical causation (e.g. Marxism or non-Marxism), differing moral and metaphysical beliefs. Historical scepticism would argue that because of these we can never hope to see the unclouded truth about the past. But Mr. Walsh is less pessimistic. Given a rational basis and the fit and honest use of the evidence, varying interpretations of the past may be valid, just like portraits of an individual taken from different positions. And whilst he admits that therewith scientific objectivity "is possible only in a weakened or secondary sense," he is even ready (pp. 116-18) to consider the possibility of ultimately attaining "a single historical point of view." The historian might reply that a prior condition for this would be agreement among the philosophers themselves. He might also add that, while the premise of the subjective elements in historical interpretation may be accepted, this is obviously a varying one, varying not merely with the personality and position of the historian, but with the kind of history he is writing (e.g. political, economic, intellectual); that with the great development of historical writing and thought (as of historical experience in a changing world) the nature, number, and quality of historical interpretations are more familiar and easier to assess and allow for; and finally that there does take place in historical thought as knowledge increases a sort of cumulative process whereby an ever larger number of facts can be taken as "given," accepted, and less assailable. To all of which Mr. Walsh would probably agree. The last three chapters of the book, on "speculative philosophy of history" from Kant to Toynbee, are of necessity summary, but like the rest of the book of distinct value to the student of history.

The University of Toronto R. FLENLEY

Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion, 1640-1660. By B. H. G. WORMALD. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1951. Pp. xiv, 331. $4.75.

THIS is the first of two volumes planned by Mr. Wormald on the career and achievements of Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon. The book is not in the form of a biography, although the material here presented, and the conclusions, carefully worked out and cautiously stated, will be the essentials of the bio-

graphy of the royalist statesman that is yet to be written. This volume deals with the period of the Long Parliament, the Civil War, and the years of exile. The first and the most interesting section of the book relates in detail the development of the struggle from the summer of 1641 until Hyde's departure from Oxford towards the close of the war. It is perhaps the most illuminating analysis of the struggle, as seen by an intelligent and moderate royalist, that has yet been written. Hyde is here presented as essentially the man of compromise. Mr. Wormald maintains that he joined Charles I, not because of his opposition to the religious reforms advocated by the Puritans, nor because of his adherence to an academic theory of constitutional orthodoxy, but because he saw in the King and in the group that was gathering about him a greater readiness to compromise than was to be found in the intransigents led by Pym and Hampden.

The later sections deal with Clarendon's *History*, with his religious opinions and his policy with respect to the national church. The account of events given in the *History* is skilfully related to the explanation of Hyde's aims and efforts in 1641 and 1642. In retrospect Hyde seems to have judged his opponents more severely. The differences, as interpreted by Mr. Wormald, had not been so great in 1642 as to preclude the possibility of a peaceful settlement, if Pym and his supporters had shown any disposition to compromise. Hyde's objective never varied. His aim was simply a restoration of the constitution on the basis of the reforms of 1641, but without a complete victory for either side, above all without a victory gained by mere military power. In Mr. Wormald's opinion he always distinguished between what he called "the criminality of the leadership" of the Long Parliament and "the moral and political integrity of the bulk of its members."

In religion Hyde is here described as a latitudinarian. The word is difficult to define, but it is clear that he shared the Erastianism that was so evident in the House of Commons. A good deal of emphasis is placed on his disagreement with Laud and on his association with Falkland and the group at Great Tew. This aspect of his work will no doubt be considered more fully in the volume which deals with the Restoration period.

This book will be of interest mainly to those who already have some knowledge of the period. It is based very largely on Clarendon's printed works, but there are many references to manuscript sources. The publisher's claim that it reverses the ideas hitherto held of Clarendon is perhaps a little extreme; but it does demonstrate that Clarendon was a more important figure, and that he possessed more of the quality of the statesman than has been allowed by those who have dismissed him as a simple careerist, or who have assumed that he was prevented, by his ecclesiasticism, or by his pedantic legalism, from seeing the realities of the situation as clearly as his opponents.

The University of Toronto — D. J. McDougall

The Law and Working of the Constitution: Documents 1660-1914. I. *1660-1783.* II. *1784-1914.* Edited by W. C. Costin and J. Steven Watson. London: Adam and Charles Black [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1952. Pp. xviii, 465; xx, 531. $4.75; $5.00.

These documents will be of the greatest value to students and teachers of the constitutional history of modern Britain. Together they contain the fullest and

most representative collection of material on the subject that has ever been published. The documents have been selected with great care. In all they number between four and five hundred, ranging from statutes and judicial decisions to extracts from the correspondence of leading statesmen and from such sources as cabinet minutes, commission reports, memoranda, and the novels of Disraeli and Trollope. The arrangement is clear and simple. In each volume the documents are divided into four sections, the last, under the title of miscellania, being perhaps of greatest interest for the wealth of material which it contains on the development of cabinet government. An admirable system of cross references enables the reader to select without difficulty the series of documents which relate to a particular topic; and each volume contains, in addition to the editors' introduction, a convenient glossary of legal terms and a very full index of proper names and subjects.

Much of this material has already appeared in earlier collections; but the emphasis here is on the working of the constitution, and a striking feature is the large number of documents illustrating the development of the executive and the slowly changing relations between the monarch, the ministers, and the House of Commons. On most points the documents are adequate, but there are some curious omissions. Pitt's letter of resignation in 1801 is quoted, but not the illuminating correspondence between him and the King which preceded his return to office in 1804. Nothing has been taken from the correspondence of Wellington or Peel on the crisis of 1829 and the surrender of George IV and his Tory ministry on the question of Catholic Emancipation. Nor is there much here to illustrate some of the most important issues in the struggle for the first Reform Bill. Space is no doubt an important consideration; but such documents as Lord Ebrington's resolution, and the interpretation given to it by Peel and by Lord Grey, are surely important evidence on the question of the King's right to choose his own ministers.

A second, and a welcome feature of this collection is the inclusion of passages from political writers. Halifax, Locke, Blackstone, Burke, and some others are represented. On some questions the editors appear to have preferred conservative opinion. The "Representative Principle in 1832" is illustrated by a single passage from Disraeli's *Coningsby*. Nothing is cited from the debates on the bill. A long passage from Bagehot is included, apparently for the purpose of illustrating what is described in a prefatory quotation from C. S. L. Amery as "the misreading of our constitution in the last century by the dominant school of liberal writers."

These documents are published without comment or explanation, and only rarely are there suggestions for further reading. In their brief introduction the editors explain—with some scathing remarks about the practice of their predecessors in this matter—the unwisdom of including such material in a book of this kind. They may be right; but many of the documents will not be so clear to the uninitiated as they are to the scholars who have edited these volumes; and a short bibliography would have enhanced the value of the work. In a book that is intended, *inter alia,* to correct "the cruder Whig misinterpretations" of the eighteenth century, and to suggest the true line of cabinet and party development, it is at least a little curious to find no mention of the names of Professor Namier, Sir Ivor Jennings, and other scholars who have made signal contributions to this subject in recent years. But these are minor points.

They do not seriously impair the value of a book that is beyond comparison the most useful work of the kind that has yet been published.

The University of Toronto D. J. McDougall

Lloyd George. By Thomas Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited]. 1951. Pp. xvi, 330, with maps and illustrations. $6.75.

This is not the long-awaited definitive biography of Lloyd George. It is, rather, to use Mr. Jones's own phrase, "an interim, unofficial contribution" from a civil servant "who saw much" of him. Its purpose is a very modest one; one must add that its achievement is very modest as well.

If and when the biography of Lloyd George is written, it will of necessity largely focus on the two great periods of his career—the years from 1906 to 1910 as radical leader in a cabinet largely preoccupied with social reform, and the years of wartime greatness as Minister of Munitions and then Prime Minister. The second of these periods is dealt with fairly fully by Mr. Jones—it is here that perhaps the value of his book lies—but the first is hardly discussed. The "war on poverty," the great measures of 1906 to 1909, the Budget of that latter date, and the constitutional crisis with the Lords are all dismissed in some eight pages (pp. 33-41). After all, one can hardly dismiss the "new Liberalism" of that era by making Lloyd George the moving force of the whole programme, and by saying (p. 34) that "what he did was to spike the Socialist guns with essentially Conservative social measures derived from the Liberal arsenal." Whatever that means!

In dealing with the other great period in Lloyd George's career, his work as wartime leader, Mr. Jones is more successful. Here he draws upon his own diary and his own recollections as assistant secretary of the Cabinet, and here he provides some interesting new light upon Lloyd George.

The book has little to say about the numerous controversial allegations that have been made against Lloyd George, but on the touchiest of all the issues, Lloyd George's manœuvring of Asquith out of office and the formation of the coalition, Mr. Jones does say a little more. Even here he fears that his account of "Lloyd George's activities during 1916, when he was treading the winding stair to the Premiership, has sometimes shown him in an unflattering light" (p. 91). There are those who would maintain that the light is neither unflattering enough, nor even bright enough!

There are other inadequacies as well. The role of the dominions in imperial politics, the development of an Imperial War Cabinet, the movement towards definition of dominion status—matters of some importance to Lloyd George certainly—are not mentioned here. Canada, for example, is named twice (when Lloyd George visited her) but Australia and New Zealand are ignored.

Mr. Jones quite obviously tried to play the impartial observer, but his admiration for the fact that Lloyd George "got things done" keeps bobbing up in unexpected ways. Thus, J. M. Keynes's *Economic Consequences of the Peace,* attacking Lloyd George's peace, is a "sensational pamphlet," consisting of "extravagant, ill-founded strictures" (p. 177), while Keynes's pamphlet supporting Lloyd George's famous plan to conquer unemployment in 1929 is "the most brilliant piece of election literature produced during the controversy" (p. 229).

This is not the biography of Lloyd George, but as a purely personal bit of reminiscing, supported by judicious reference to the already voluminous literature on the man, it is of interest to students of Britain's fortunes during the present century.

United College Winnipeg — J. H. S. REID

The History of Canada or New France. Vol I. By FRANÇOIS DU CREUX, s.j. Translated with an Introduction by PERCY J. ROBINSON; edited with notes by JAMES B. CONACHER. The Publications of the Champlain Society, XXX. Toronto: The Champlain Society. 1951. Pp. xxviii, 404, xv.

COMME il s'agit de la traduction anglaise d'une œuvre écrite en latin, on me permettra sans doute, pour augmenter la confusion des langues, d'en parler en français. Si jamais la Champlain Society a rempli le but de ses fondateurs « to publish rare or inaccessible material relating to the history of Canada » c'est bien lorsqu'elle décida de publier une traduction anglaise de *Historiæ Canadensis sev Novæ-Franciæ libri decem ad annum usque Christi MDCLVI* du père François Du Creux de la Compagnie de Jésus. Pour accomplir cette tâche difficile on a eu la chance exceptionnelle de trouver dans le docteur Percy J. Robinson, auteur de *Toronto during the French Régime*, un homme possédant à la fois une bonne connaissance du latin et de l'histoire du Canada. Quant aux notes, elles ont été préparées par M. James B. Conacher. Le premier volume a été publié en 1951, dix-neuf mois après l'envoi du manuscrit aux imprimeurs de Glasgow, nous dit le rapport de 1952 de la Société, et le second est annoncé pour l'automne de 1952. L'introduction de M. Robinson n'ajoute guère à l'étude que M. Casimir Hébert publiait en 1945 dans le recueil consacré par la Société historique de Montréal au centenaire de l'*Histoire du Canada* de François-Xavier Garneau. « Information about Du Creux is meagre », précise M. Robinson qui a cependant réuni sur le jésuite français tous les détails possibles. La traduction est excellente et on aurait souhaité, si le coût n'en eût été prohibitif, que le texte latin fut réimprimé en regard du texte anglais. L'édition originale de 1664 est devenue assez rare. Nous avons pu cependant consulter le magnifique exemplaire que possède la bibliothèque de l'Université Laval et qui a appartenu à l'historien l'abbé Hospice Verreau. La lecture comparée des deux textes révèle que l'anglais de M. Robinson suit fidèlement le latin, tout en étant beaucoup plus élégant que lui. On se demande cependant si le père Du Creux ajoute énormément aux *Relations* des Jésuites et aux *Voyages* de Champlain dont il s'est d'ailleurs inspiré. Ce qui ne signifie pas que la traduction anglaise n'était pas nécessaire. Elle permettra dorénavant à tous ceux qui écrivent sur les débuts de la colonie française de référer au père Du Creux qu'il leur sera plus facile de consulter en anglais qu'en latin. Car tous nos historiens ne sont pas aussi bons latinistes que M. Robinson.

Québec — JEAN-CHARLES BONENFANT

Liberty and Property. By R. V. COLEMAN. New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons [Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders & Co. Ltd.]. 1951. Pp. xvi, 606. $6.75.

MR. ROY V. COLEMAN is that *rara avis*, a cross between a scholar and a business man. As managing editor of a New York publishing house he brings to

his writing the determination, as well as the more common desire, to produce a book that will sell widely; but as a result of his academic training he also maintains a high standard of scholarly method and of the paraphernalia of documentation. The result is a pleasing and useful new book on his special interest, the colonial period of the history of the United States.

"Liberty and Property" was, not unnaturally, the watchword of some of the American patriots. Mr. Coleman deals in this volume with the period from 1664 to 1765, the century during which the thirteen British continental colonies grew to maturity and prepared themselves, largely unconsciously, for independence. In an earlier book, *The First Frontier*, the author of *Liberty and Property* has already covered the period of early settlement. It is to be hoped that he will complete the trilogy by a book on the Revolution.

If C. M. Andrews may be said to have written from a desk in the Public Record Office and from the vantage point of the centre of a developing empire, Mr. Coleman definitely looks in the opposite direction. He takes his stand in North America and watches the "opening-up" of the country by white men. Concerned primarily with the area which is now the United States, he nevertheless follows the activities of Frenchmen, Spaniards, Swedes, and Dutchmen as well as English, Scots, Irish, and Pennsylvania Dutch. Mr. Coleman is not, like Andrews and Osgood, interested chiefly in institutions of empire, nor, like Gipson, with the growth of the British Empire as a whole and the conflict of nations for control of the continent. He makes no attempt to give a complete picture of the social or the political or the economic organization of the colonies. He does not dwell on the climate of colonial opinion. Nor does he, like Curtis P. Nettels, seek for the origins of American nationalism. But he succeeds in incorporating something from all these facets of American development into his story of the settlement of half a continent.

At all times he has an eye for the dramatic incident and the striking quotation; and only occasionally does his flair for a picturesque word or phrase or a powerful generalization lead him into trouble. His "group individualism" is a strange phrase with which to describe the particularism of the various colonies (p. 196); his statement that the slump in New England at the turn of the century was the result of new conditions of enforcement of the Navigation Acts neglects such important factors as the war with France (p. 176); and it is altogether too much to swallow his conclusion that "King William . . . was to prove an expensive luxury for England and England's American colonies" (p. 161). King James would have bankrupted liberty in both countries.

Inevitably *Liberty and Property* touches upon the Canadian story but only in so far as French expansion infringed upon territory which later became first British and then American. Once again Mr. Coleman allows his dramatic sense to lead him into dangerous conclusions. It is not true that, during the period with which he was concerned in this book, fear of France caused "England to hold a tight control over her American colonies . . . [and caused] the colonists to accept that control" (p. 39). English imperial sway was marked during this period by its looseness rather than its rigidity. Only in the last year of Mr. Coleman's period were the screws tightened and then, as he shows, the fear of France had already been removed, and the colonists would not accept control from London.

The Royal Military College of Canada R. A. PRESTON

The Territorial Papers of the United States. XV. *The Territory of Louisiana-Missouri, 1815-21* (*Continued*). Compiled and edited by CLARENCE EDWIN CARTER. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office. 1951. Pp. vi, 834.

WITH this volume Dr. Carter brings to a close one phase of his ambitious and commendable project: in 1821 Missouri ceased to be a territory and became a state of the Union. The legal status of Missouri, however, from the date of its first constitution, July 19, 1820, to its admission into the Union, by proclamation, on August 10, 1821, has been the subject of much discussion and conflicting ideas, the result, no doubt, of the struggle to maintain a balance of political power between free and slave states.

As in other volumes in this series, already reviewed in the pages of the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, the documents are arranged chronologically and without comment, except for copious footnotes and references which indicate the editor's meticulous care in preparing the documents for publication. There is a very good index of 87 pages, double column, a map (p. 100) showing the progress of surveys up to 1816, and another (p. 118) giving proposed mail routes.

Students of contemporary prairie settlements will find much in this volume to interest them on such topics, *inter alia*, as wages and prices, the cost and difficulties of survey, "perjury bold and atrocious" by claimants for land (pp. 9-10), "the speculative land-jobbing Executive officers" (p. 502), the inrush of settlers and the ubiquitous and troublesome squatters, military claims arising out of the War of 1812, and the amazing and welcome discovery of a plain of salt 15 to 20 miles long by 1 to 2 miles wide (p. 284).

The Treaty of Ghent restored the status quo between Britain and the United States, but not peace between the Indian tribes of the West, or a cessation of attacks upon the white settlements: ". . . the Indians are more hostile than ever before" (pp. 394-5); ". . . the Great Osage . . . are more vicious than they formerly were—They have killed our citizens" (p. 360). Of the Osage the Cherokee chiefs complain bitterly: " . . . we made peace with them several times, . . . but they will not be at peace with us; . . . they have stolen our best horses, . . . at this time the rivers are red with the blood of the Cherokees" (p. 304).

The main causes of Indian unrest are obvious. Deprived of their hunting grounds as punishment for their part in the War of 1812, crowded into narrower territory, short of food and anxious for the future, they turned upon each other in desperation, and upon the white settlers who inherited their former property. "Hordes of hunters and licentious traders" (p. 257) entered Indian villages and camps and inflamed their hostility to the American government (pp. 448-9). Numbered among these traders were "the Emissaries of Britain" (pp. 195-6), reputed to be financed by J. J. Astor (p. 175), and licensed by the American government (pp. 262-6). "Colonel [Robert] Dickson," Lord Selkirk's "agent" (p. 396) appears again, "up to his old tricks" in "speaking ill of the Americans and corrupting their young men" (p. 412); arrested on May 16, 1818, he was jailed in Fort Crawford (p. 394). It was confidently asserted that all the Indian tribes "in the West are under British influence," and would continue to be so long as British traders were allowed to trade within

United States territory. Perhaps it was vain to expect those untamed children of the open spaces to convert "their spears into pruning hooks" overnight.

To pacify the tribes various remedies were proposed—bounties, education, less whiskey, more government-controlled factories, but nothing was said about justice to these helpless victims of the white man's greed for land.

This volume repeats the high standard of its predecessors.

McMaster University NORMAN MACDONALD

Democratic Government and Politics. By J. A. CORRY. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Canadian Government Series, R. MACG. DAWSON, Editor: I. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 691. $5.00.

THE first edition of Professor Corry's book consisted for the most part of a description and analysis of the constitution and operation of the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada, preceded by some preliminary chapters on political theory relating to those governments, and followed by a comparison with dictatorships. In the present edition, which is considerably longer, the added chapters are devoted to the more general ideas—or to the ideology—of democracy.

It is no easy task to combine in one volume—even in what is now a large volume—the forms, the actual working, and the philosophy of democracy. For reasons which are never fully explained, the descriptive chapters are almost wholly on the three countries mentioned, though French institutions are suddenly introduced in the chapter on local government, and the European dictatorships inevitably appear in the last chapter. Perhaps for reasons of length no more attention could be given to democracy outside the British Isles and North America, though one could wish that the great European tradition had been brought more firmly before North American readers. The problems and successes of democracy, in the Scandinavian countries, the Low Countries, and France, for example, are of great significance to Mr. Corry's general thesis. There are, moreover, pitfalls in the path of democracy that are exemplified in various countries with generally democratic constitutions, and which may usefully be studied in addition to the picture of the stark contrast between working democracies on the one hand and dictatorships on the other.

Professor Corry combines a deep knowledge and understanding of his subject with an easy and attractive style. In the chapters descriptive of the various aspects of government in the three countries with which he is chiefly concerned his touch is always sure, his explanations clear, and his comments apt and reasonable. There is little on provincial or state government, and the chapter on local government is perhaps not as effective as those on the central governments. On the whole, however, this is an account in which even the most exact critics will find little to question, and which will long be recognized as a standard work.

There will be a general appreciation of the value of the broad approach which the author has used. Constitutional forms can be unreal without an understanding of their meaning, their relation to convention, and the ways in which they have been interpreted and applied. Furthermore, the author has clearly felt that the peoples of the democracies must know not only the types of government under which they live but also their significance in society and

in the everyday life of those who take a greater or lesser part in ruling themselves.

Ottawa GEORGE DE T. GLAZEBROOK

Inuk: "Au dos de la terre!" By ROGER BULIARD o.m.i. Collaboration littéraire de JOSEPH SACHOT o.m.i.; dessins, couverture et cartes d'ANDRÉ MILLOT o.m.i. Paris: Editions Saint-Germain. 1949. Pp. 355.

Inuk. By ROGER P. BULIARD. With an introduction by FULTON J. SHEEN. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited]. 1951. Pp. xii, 322. $4.00.

Inuk, Father Roger Buliard's account of his experiences during more than twelve years as an Oblate missionary in the western Canadian Arctic, has been published first in French and later in English. The English edition is not a straight translation of the French and the two differ considerably in arrangement and style, and to some degrees in content. The French version includes a number of attractive illustrations by Father Millot and consists of two parts, one a general description of the country and its inhabitants, and the other an account of the activities of the Roman Catholic Church and especially of Father Buliard. The English version omits the illustrations, combines both parts in a single narrative, and is apparently intended to appeal to a wide audience in North America. In this it has been extremely successful; it is easy and interesting to read and is enjoying a large sale.

The Copper Eskimo, among whom Father Buliard's work lay, have long been known to have their faults. Father Buliard, in contrast to other writers, allows them practically no virtues. Almost all Roman Catholic missionaries in the north speak highly of their parishioners, and scholars such as Rasmussen and Jenness have written of them with sympathy and understanding. It is all the more surprising to find Father Buliard so critical and so eager to find fault. For instance, he illustrates the contempt he considers Eskimos to have for their women by recording a conversation about a puppy.

" 'What is it?' I asked. 'Arna.'. . . 'A female. A bitch.' He would have used the same word—arna, a bitch—to designate his wife or his daughter. Already you think, 'Poor woman.' "

It would have been fairer to the Eskimo if Father Buliard had explained that *arna* simply means female, and that an Eskimo wife would similarly describe a dog, a male walrus, or her husband as *angot*—a male.

Father Buliard brands all Eskimos as liars and thieves, a statement with which practically every northern traveller would take strong issue, and considers them cruel, ruthless, hypocritical, and cunning. He also states: "They have no art, no literature, no written language, almost no religion. There is no room for anything but the struggle for life itself"; yet he was writing about the same tribe that Rasmussen described in *The Intellectual Culture of the Copper Eskimos:* "Never in any other single group, neither in Greenland, Canada or Alaska have I met such a poetically gifted people." There are also strange inconsistencies in *Inuk.* Father Buliard condemns the giving away or selling for trifles of young children, yet he describes "a lucky piece of speculation" in which he himself buys a baby girl for his Eskimo helper for "a spare pair of pants, twenty pounds of flour, and ten pounds of sugar." On one page he states, "Other peoples have preserved the deeds of their forebears in epic

poetry, in narrative or at least in the symbolism of tradition. Not so the Eskimos. They are a people without a past." Later on he describes a drum dance: "And one lament follows the other as the singer dips into a repertoire as old as his people, fashioning his verses from a legend that reaches back through the centuries, across the Arctic Sea, across Bering Strait to the terrible vastness of the blank Mongolian desert."

Father Buliard's criticisms are not directed wholly against the Eskimos. The R.C.M.P., the Canadian Government, the Hudson's Bay Company, and other missionaries all receive more blame than praise. It is alarming to read that the R.C.M.P. often wink at murder while harshly punishing hunting offences. The Government is accused of indifference to the welfare of the natives, and complicity with trading companies is suggested. The Anglican missionaries are said to have used prejudice and hatred to strengthen their cause. These are serious charges if well founded, but Father Buliard presents little supporting evidence. During long years of isolation, small incidents can become magnified out of all proportion, and this may have affected Father Buliard's judgment.

The French version is rather longer than the English but no less bitter, and includes criticism of the attitude of English-speaking Canadians towards their French-speaking countrymen and other matters which, for some reason, have been omitted in the English text.

There are a number of inaccuracies throughout the book; the following are some examples. The population of Canadian Eskimos in 1950 is given as 5,000, and is said to be declining. The most recent census (1941) gives 7,616, an incomplete figure, and all evidence points to a steady increase for the past thirty or forty years. Father Ostan did not contract rabies at Igloolik when bitten by a dog. It is difficult to believe that Father Buliard really felt he was going to plant the cross farther north than it had ever been carried, and this statement must certainly be a surprise to the Roman Catholic mission at Pond Inlet in Baffin Island. There is no evidence that any of the Franklin expedition were massacred. It is said to be significant that the Eskimos have no word for mother, though in fact they do have such a word and use it as frequently as we do.

It is unfortunate that a book on the north should be both so readable and so misleading. Those who know the Canadian Arctic will read Father Buliard's book with interest but also with regret.

Ottawa GRAHAM ROWLEY

The Y.M.C.A. in Canada: The Chronicle of a Century. By MURRAY G. ROSS. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1951. Pp. xviii, 517. $6.00.

History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America. By C. HOWARD HOPKINS. New York: Association Press. 1951. Pp. xiv, 818.

MANY volumes published to commemorate the anniversary of an organization turn out to be but veiled compilations of ordered facts. And when a subtitle bears the word "chronicle," one's fears are increased. But Dr. Ross's volume is a worth-while interpretive essay, for he is a sociologist concerned with tracing the evolution of goals and techniques of an organization which, starting in Canada in 1851 from exceedingly small beginnings and rather confused perspective, has sought to meet with progressive enterprise and innovation the challenges of a quickly evolving civilization.

Throughout its history the Y.M.C.A. has found strength in holding local and general conventions, and the formulation of written statements of objectives. The evangelical habits of mind of the earlier leaders have gradually been re-interpreted, the position being taken quite early in its life that the Y.M.C.A.'s sphere of operation lay parallel to, and was complementary to, that of the organized churches. The reassessment of goals and methods, it is claimed, are still in order to-day: "Problems of industrial management—of finance and building operation—consistently occupy the major attention of Association leaders. ... [This] means some diminution in the basic friendliness of the Association, some growth in its conservative temper, less disposition to experiment and more reliance on existing programme patterns." "The lack of consensus about basic objectives for the Association is, perhaps, fundamental to all other matters. This is no new problem ... [but it] is much more acute to-day. This is due to the complexity and uncertainty of present day social life; to the increasing difficulty youth has in finding direction for his life in this setting. ..."

Throughout the book an effort has been made to fit the Y.M.C.A.'s experiences into the background of Canadian life from era to era, and some new insights into that background emerge. Short biographical sketches of important Association leaders are informative.

The volume is well produced and contains some nineteen photographic reproductions of manuscript letters, broadsheets, buildings, and activities. Four appendices present Association statements of purpose and its constitutions in 1851, 1854, and 1946. The footnotes, which are assembled at the end of the volume, not only indicate sources, but enumerate important details.

The volume by C. Howard Hopkins undertakes a similar service for the Y.M.C.A. in the United States, where a century of growth from the Montreal beginning is also being commemorated. As Dr. Ross and Mr. Hopkins coordinated their work, this latter volume leaves details of the development of the Association in Canada largely to Dr. Ross's enterprise.

Acadia University PAUL GRANT CORNELL

Next-Year Country: A Study of Rural Social Organization in Alberta. By JEAN BURNET. Social Credit in Alberta, S. D. CLARK, Editor, 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Pp. xvi, 188. $4.00.

THIS is the third volume of the "Social Credit in Alberta" series to be published and it is the first one to deal exclusively with Alberta. It is a well-written, clear analysis of the impact of the economic and social developments of the twenties and thirties on the Hanna rural municipality—a drought-stricken section of Alberta. Miss Burnet has set out to discover "the kind of disturbances within the Alberta social structure which made possible the rise of Social Credit." She examines the economic and social background of the district, the ethnic divisions, the relations between town and country, and the class structure as it evolved both in the rural village and in the town of Hanna. She concludes that the socio-economic tensions of the area and the lack of stable adjustment to the environment have "contributed both to personal disorganization and to social unrest."

As a sociological study this book is both interesting and stimulating. Miss Burnet gives a thorough and convincing explanation of the nature of the class

structure in the rural western community and how local political and social institutions actually operate. But as a contribution to western Canadian history it is too limited in its scope to be of great value. There is no attempt to relate conditions in the Hanna district to the province as a whole and nowhere does she make clear why Alberta, unlike Saskatchewan and Manitoba, has remained loyal to independent agrarian parties throughout the past three decades. Her inadequate acquaintanceship with the political literature of this period has led Miss Burnet to make misleading and over-simplified historical judgments. Also some of her conclusions in regard to the position and attitude of the farmer seem to reflect the prejudices of her urban informants.

Despite these weaknesses, however, *Next-Year Country* remains a valuable contribution to the growing literature of the Canadian West. Miss Burnet has given us a detailed picture of the rural community as it struggled against the twin misfortunes of drought and depression. It is unfortunate, in view of her extensive knowledge of the district, that she has been unable to examine the impact of the économic changes of the past five years on the Hanna area, which she last visited in 1946. It would be interesting to learn if this re-examination would lead to any significant modification of her original conclusions.

Tulane University WILLIAM K. ROLPH

SHORTER NOTICES

Some Modern Historians of Britain. Essays in honor of R. L. SCHUYLER by some of his former students at Columbia University. Edited by HERMAN AUSUBEL, J. BARTLET BREBNER, and ERLING M. HUNT. New York: The Dryden Press. 1951. Pp. 384.

THIS is a useful and interesting book, although it is not as comprehensive as might be wished and sometimes has an air of uncertainty which lessens its distinction.

It was published with a double purpose. In the first place it is a tribute in honour of Professor Schuyler "to commemorate his many years of distinguished service at Columbia University, and his election to the Presidency of the American Historical Association." To that end, twenty-two former students have contributed twenty-two essays. The second purpose is to publish the essays themselves. They have a certain real unity in that all are studies of well-known "modern historians of Britain." Those chosen make a very interesting list, John Lingard, Henry Hallam, Thomas Carlyle, James Anthony Froude, Sir Henry Maine, Goldwin Smith, Samuel Rawson Gardiner, Sir Leslie Stephen, W. E. H. Lecky, Lord Morley, Sir George O. Trevelyan, George Burton Adams, Sir Charles H. Firth, Charles McLean Andrews, Elie Halévy, Sir William Holdsworth, George Louis Beer, A. P. Newton, Winston S. Churchill, R. H. Tawney, L. B. Namier, Eileen Power.

In the Preface the authors explain why other historians have not been included. Three—Macaulay, Green and Maitland—were omitted because Professor Schuyler is about to publish essays on them himself. All others were left out because none of the contributors offered to write essays on them. Perhaps this is as good a reason as any. In any case it needs no philosophical justification. At the same time the book would have been more useful if it had aimed at being more comprehensive. It goes far, but it does not go far

enough. The omissions are too conspicuous. What we have is a useful book of reference, but it might have been much more useful.

It is not necessary to pick and choose amongst the various essays. They all reach a high degree of competence without, in most cases, attaining to that degree of authority and distinction that makes the reader feel that the last word has been spoken. In some cases the authors seen timid about expressing their own opinions. They take refuge behind the opinion of others. Moreover, it would be impossible to determine the relative importance of historians by the amount of space given to each. Gardiner is disposed of in twelve pages, while Newton receives twenty.

Dalhousie University GEORGE WILSON

Essays Honoring Lawrence C. Wroth. Portland, Me.: The Anthoensen Press. 1951. Pp. xxii, 515.

BOOKS of essays written to honour an eminent scholar—*Festschriften,* as the Germans term them—are apt to partake of the character of an *olla podrida.* The present handsome volume, which has been published in honour of Dr. Lawrence C. Wroth, the distinguished librarian of the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, Rhode Island, is no exception to the rule. It is true that the committee which has arranged its publication has limited the field of the volume to essays that deal with *Americana* prior to 1801—"the field in which Mr. Wroth and the John Carter Brown have gained world renown." But even in this field the essays deal with the most diverse subjects, such as "Columbus in Sixteenth-century Poetry," "American Booksellers' Catalogues, 1734-1800," "The Melody of 'The Star-Spangled Banner,'" "Eighteenth-century American Fiction," and "A List of Published Writings of Lawrence C. Wroth to December 31, 1950." Even to a bibliographer, some of these papers will appear sufficiently recondite.

The only papers having a direct bearing on Canadian history are that entitled "Comparative Cartography, Exemplified in an Analytical & Bibliographical Description of Nearly One Hundred Maps and Charts of the American Continent Published in Great Britain during the Years 1600 to 1850," by Henry Stevens and Roland Tree, and that entitled "A Half-century of Canadian Life and Print, 1751-1800," by Marie Tremaine. The first of these contains much detailed information of value to the student of Canadian cartography; and the second is a running survey of the literature listed in Miss Tremaine's long-awaited and forthcoming bibliography, "Canadian Imprints, 1751–1800," in the preparation of which Mr. Wroth apparently gave Miss Tremaine generous help. The paper covers much the same ground as the earlier chapters of the late Ægidius Fauteux's *The Introduction of Printing into Canada* (Montreal, 1930), and in some details supplements it. But one misses in the essay the lively and entertaining discussion of some of the problems of early Canadian bibliography to be found in Fauteux's pioneer work.

The book is a striking tribute to the work of an outstanding American librarian, bibliographer, and scholar.

The University of Toronto W. S. WALLACE

The Heritage of Western Culture: Essays on the Origin and Development of Modern Culture. Edited by RANDOLPH CARLETON CHALMERS. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1952. Pp. x, 117. $2.50 (cloth), $2.00 (paper).

FIVE chapters of this little volume are concerned with periods of the past; two are concerned with present problems. Miss M. E. White gives a clear and straightforward essay on Greece and Rome. Principal W. C. Graham has a narrow and detailed study of Hebraic religion, particularly Messianism. In two chapters Professor K. H. Cousland provides an historical sketch of the early and medieval Christian Church. The general editor offers some conclusions on the Renaissance and the Reformation. Professor J. A. Irving discusses the place of science and philosophy in modern culture, and Professor Northrop Frye examines trends in modern culture (particularly American), with special reference to deism and to the conflict between communism and democracy.

The volume is timely, and, with some reservations, useful. All the writers are experts. Some chapters, especially the first and third, are well written. The last two provide food for thought about present-day problems, though they will probably provoke some disagreement. But the effectiveness of the volume is marred by an over-ambitious title, and by an editorial failure to co-ordinate effort. There is little serious attempt, anywhere, to evaluate the heritage of the West. There is an excessive concentration on Christianity and the Church. The reason for these weaknesses is explained by the editor; but no reason is given for his failure to get his collaborators to broaden their approach in view of the title he had chosen for their work.

The University of Toronto B. WILKINSON

The Sinclair Expedition to Nova Scotia in 1398: A Pre-Columbian Crossing of the Atlantic Definitely Dated as to Year, Month, and Day of Landing. By FREDERICK J. POHL. Pictou, N.S.: Pictou Advocate Press. 1950. Pp. 45, with maps. $1.00.

Who Discovered America? The Amazing Story of Madoc. By ZELLA ARMSTRONG. Chattanooga, Tenn.: Lookout Publishing Company. 1950. Pp. xvi, 216, with maps and illustrations.

THE Zeno fabrications appear again in the first of these books. Here is revived the old identification of Zichmni with Henry Sinclair, Earl of Orkney (first made by John Reinhold Forster in 1784 and imitated by R. J. Major, 1873 and by others). This reviewer cannot swallow the tale here told, although he can understand that this would be easy for one who accepts as historical fact the existence in the fourteenth century of a Dominican monastery, blessed with central heat, far north on the east coast of Greenland. One is tempted to write at length about the absurdities of this tract, but let it suffice to echo the remarks of an earlier critic of the Zeno fiction, Moses Pitts (1680): "It is not our business to write or repeat romances."

The other book assembles the meagre evidence for the presence of Madoc and other Welshmen in America in the twelfth century and the fate of their descendants. Those who enjoy weaving such slender webs will welcome this book, which, although the author is convinced that Madoc was in America, is written with some restraint and moderation.

The University of Manitoba T. J. OLESON

Local Government in Canada. By HORACE L. BRITTAIN. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1951. Pp. x, 251. $6.00.

THIS book makes welcome news as the first published survey of local government in Canada, other than a volume of short papers edited by S. M. Wickett forty-five years ago. Since the author's major purpose is to describe and evaluate present municipal institutions, he has compressed the story of early developments in Canada and the tracing of British and American influences into the first twenty-one pages. Throughout the text, however, description and comment are illuminated by Dr. Brittain's unique acquaintance with local government in this country extending over more than a third of a century.

The book is clearly written in a direct, strong style. It is well organized, brief, and to the point. Following the historical introduction, it outlines and explains municipal and local school organization in various parts of Canada, deals generally with municipal administration and financing, and then focusses attention on current weaknesses and problems. Three lengthy appendices are given over to a more detailed statement of municipal and local school establishments and to an account of the provincial controls exercised in part through general legislation and in part by supervisory departments and agencies. The material was originally prepared several years ago, but important recent developments have been covered and a brief chapter has been added on Newfoundland. The presentation is elaborately documented but would be improved by a more detailed index.

Beyond providing an accurate general reference, Dr. Brittain's book should stimulate greater recognition of the role of local authorities in Canadian affairs; it should also encourage further examination of particular administrative forms and problems in regard to citizen control and participation in government.

Toronto ERIC HARDY

The Old Northwest: Pioneer Period, 1815–1840. Vols. I, II. By R. CARLYLE BULEY. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 1951. Pp. xvi, 632; x, 686. $19.

The Old Northwest, the Pulitzer Prize winner of 1951, is an important book in the Turner tradition. It describes in detail how the pioneer society of the first west advanced toward political maturity, adjusting its economy to fit its needs, and at the same time creating its own social standards.

Mr. Buley refuses to type frontiersmen and squatters, and he shows the infinite variety of outlook which prevailed among them. He is completely at home with his subject, and no aspect of it escapes his attention. His chapters on medicine, amusements, education, religion, and science are delightfully written and contain a wealth of new material. His attention has been caught by the fascination of the everyday life of the people in the Old Northwest, and he has probably reconstructed the life during the period from 1815 until 1840 as accurately as will ever be done. This is where the great merit of the book lies.

When it comes to seeing the relationship of this segment to the whole of American society, the reader could wish for more assistance. Sectionalism, to Mr. Buley, is nationalism divided up, and his concern is with showing the reactions of the people in the Old Northwest to the significant political

questions disturbing the national scene. But we are left with no impression of the significance of those reactions in the world beyond the limits of the section. He discards the theory that the organized crusade against slavery originated in the Old Northwest. It may be that it was only after 1840, his terminating point, that the impact of the west on the national scene was really felt. It is true that politics is only one of the many topics discussed in the book, and that this is a study of settlement processes, but unless relationships are brought out, even the most intensive examination of a section retains much of the character of local history.

We could well wish, however, that we had such informative and well written studies of settlement processes in our own country, and that we could afford to produce books of such handsome appearance.

The University of British Columbia MARGARET A. ORMSBY

Regionalism in America. Edited by MERRILL JENSEN. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1951. Pp. xvi, 425.

MOST of the contributors to this volume of fifteen articles—historians, sociologists, humanists, and administrators—approach the problems of regionalism in the United States indirectly, by imparting their general ideas on the subject through the medium of such specialized topics as the bases of southern or southwestern regionalism, linguistic traits in eastern United States, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the like. Of necessity, therefore, the reader's comprehension of the problems of regionalism grows in piecemeal fashion under a mass of incidental material, and without benefit of editorial summation, for none is forthcoming. He is left to discover from the various articles that a region is an area characterized by common physical or human elements or relationships, selected because of their significance to the viewer; that in some fields of knowledge and endeavour appropriately defined regions are useful vehicles for research and planning; and that the regional approach aids more or less in understanding various aspects of the development of the United States. Much of the last two articles is spent on an inconclusive debate on whether regionalism aggravates inevitable disharmonies within a nation, or, on the other hand, provides the best hope for true national integration through recognition and exploitation of the possibilities inherent in regional diversities. The main conclusion of the reader, however, must be that scholars from the different disciplines are little agreed on any phase of the subject—either on the meaning of regionalism, or on the definition of the boundaries of the regions of the United States, or on the function of regionalism in scholarship, or on the role of regionalism in the national life.

Carleton College M. ZASLOW

The Making of English History. Edited by ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER and HERMAN AUSUBEL. The Dryden Publications in History, RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON, General Editor. New York: The Dryden Press [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1952. Pp. xvi, 686. $7.00.

The English Radical Tradition, 1763-1914. Edited by S. MACCOBY. The British Political Tradition, ALAN BULLOCK and F. W. DEAKIN, Editors, V. London: Nicholas Kaye [Smithers & Bonellie]. 1952. Pp. xiv, 236. $4.00.

British Working Class Movements: Select Documents 1789–1875. Edited by G. D. H. COLE and A. W. FILSON. London: Macmillan & Co. [The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1951. Pp. xxii, 629. $8.50.

THESE three volumes will be useful teaching aids in the field of English history, but they are all something more as well. Although published as a text book (in double columns), the volume of Professors Schuyler and Ausubel contains a valuable collection of essays and articles (almost all unabridged) taken from about forty different publications, mostly learned journals, that will be of interest to the scholar as well as to the undergraduate, because of the inaccessibility of many of the originals.[1] The collection includes essays by many well-known British, Canadian, and American historians, such as Charles Andrews, J. B. Brebner, D. G. Creighton, R. C. K. Ensor, Godfrey Davies, G. P. Gooch, David Knowles, Harold Laski, C. H. McIlwain, J. N. L. Myres, L. B. Namier, J. U. Nef, Sydney Painter, A. F. Pollard, Conyers Read, F. M. Stenton, R. H. Tawney, G. M. Trevelyan, H. R. Trevor-Roper, J. A. Williamson, and A. S. P. Woodhouse, to mention only a few of the sixty-five contributors.

Dr. MacCoby's collection maintains the standard of earlier volumes in the British Political Tradition series, which have been reviewed in the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. The brevity of the Introduction is perhaps to be explained by the two solid volumes that the author has previously published on the subject, but it covers rather too much the same ground as the short notes introducing each of the seven sections into which the book is divided.

Messrs. Cole and Filson's collection covers much the same ground as Mr. MacCoby's but there is remarkably little duplication. This may be explained by the tremendous amount of Radical literature available, and the comparative lack of outstanding items. Selections in both books are generally brief excerpts from longer documents and even where the same source is chosen the excerpt is different. For instance MacCoby is interested in the preambles to the Chartist Petitions, Cole and Filson in the six points. *British Working Class Movements: Select Documents* is designed as a companion to Cole's *Short History of the British Working-Class Movement*, and Cole and Postgate's *The Common People.* For this reason there is no general introduction but each of the 21 chapters is introduced by a short summary of the material in the other books, with cross references. There are also short explanatory notes to most of the 193 selections. The book has perhaps more of a propaganda purpose than Dr. MacCoby's, but the high price will restrict the number of buyers.

J. B. CONACHER

The University of Toronto

[1]Other volumes in this useful series that have already appeared include Donald Sheehan, *The Making of American History,* Books I and II (1950); Herman Ausubel, *The Making of Modern Europe,* Books I and II (1951).

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

ANDERSON, EUGENE N., *Process versus Power: Studies in Modern Culture* (University of Nebraska Studies, new series no. 9, Lincoln, Neb., 1952, viii, 136 pp.).

Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte: An International Journal Concerned with the History of the Reformation and Its Significance in World Affairs, vol. XLII (1, 2), 1951 (published under the auspices of the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte and

the American Society for Reformation Research, Hanover, C. Bertelsmann, 288 pp., $5.00). *The Army Air Forces in World War II*, vol. III: *Europe: Argument to V-E Day, January 1944 to May 1945* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press [Toronto, W. J. Gage & Co. Limited], 1951, xl, 948 pp.) BEZANSON, ANNE, *Prices and Inflation during the American Revolution, Pennsylvania, 1770-1790* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press [Toronto, The Ryerson Press], 1951, xviii, 362 pp.). CARLSON, LELAND H., *An Alaskan Gold Mine: The Story of No. 9 Above* (Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1951, xii, 178 pp.). COPE, ZACHARY, *The Versatile Victorian: Being the Life of Sir Henry Thompson, Bt., 1820-1904* (London, Harvey & Blythe Ltd. [Toronto, The Copp Clark Co. Limited], 1951, xii, 179 pp., $5.00). COURT, W. H. B., *Coal* (History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Civil Series, W. K. HANCOCK, Editor, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office and Longmans, Green and Co. [Toronto, Longmans, Green and Co.], 1951, xii, 422 pp., $3.80). FAY, C. R., *Palace of Industry, 1851: A Study of the Great Exhibition and Its Fruits* (Cambridge, at the University Press; Toronto, The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1951, xii, 156 pp., $3.25). FIRBANK, THOMAS, *I Bought a Star* (London, Sydney, Toronto, Bombay, George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd. [Toronto, Clarke Irwin & Company Limited], 1951, 240 pp.). GATES, WILLIAM B., Jr., *Michigan Copper and Boston Dollars: An Economic History of the Michigan Copper Mining Industry* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press [Toronto, S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited], 1951, xvi, 301 pp., $6.75). GIRARD, LOUIS, *La Politique des travaux publics du Second Empire* (Paris, Librairie Armand Colin, 1952, xxxii, 415 pp., 1.200 fr.). HARRISON, JOHN B., *This Age of Global Strife* (Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, J. B. Lippincott Company [Toronto, Longmans, Green and Co., 1952, x, 470 pp., $7.25). HINSLEY, F. H., *Hitler's Strategy* (Cambridge, at the University Press [Toronto, The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited], 1951, xii, 254 pp., $4.00). *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, nouvelle série, XL (Paris, 1951, iv, 329 pp.). KANE, LUCILE M., trans. and ed., *Military Life in Dakota: The Journal of Philippe Regis de Trobriand* (St. Paul, Alvord Memorial Commission, 1951, xviii, 395 pp., $7.50). KIHSS, PETER, *The U.N.: How and When It Works* (Headline Series no. 88, New York, Foreign Policy Association, July-Aug., 1951, 64 pp., 35c.). KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN, ERIK VON, *Liberty or Equality: The Challenge of Our Time* (Caldwell, Idaho, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1952, x, 395 pp., $6.00). LACROIX, BENOÎT, *L'Histoire dans l'antiquité: Florilège suivi d'une étude* (Montréal, Institut d'Etudes médiévales; Paris, Librairie J. Vrin, 1951, 252 pp.). LAFONTAINE, PAUL-HENRI, *L'Evêque d'ordination des religieux des débuts du monarchisme à la mort de Louis le Pieux (840): Etude historico-juridique* (Ottawa, Les Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1951, 272 pp., $4.00). LAIDLER, HARRY W., ed., *World Cooperation and Social Progress: A Symposium* (New York, League for Industrial Democracy, 1951, 38 pp., 25c.). L'AMI, C. E., *The Green Madonna* (Philadelphia, The Westminster Press [Toronto, The Ryerson Press], 1952, 302 pp., $4.00). LANGSAM, WALTER CONSUELO, assisted by EGAN JAMES MICHAEL, *Documents and Readings in the History of Europe since 1918* (Rev. ed., Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, J. B. Lippincott Company [Toronto, Longmans Green & Co.], 1951, xxvi, 1190 pp.). LEE, DWIGHT E. and MCREYNOLDS, GEORGE E., eds., *Essays in History and International Relations in Honor of George Hubbard Blakeslee* (Worcester, Mass., Clark University, 1949, xii, 324 pp.). LEIRIS, MICHEL, *Race and Culture: The Race Question in Modern Science* (Paris, UNESCO [Toronto, University of Toronto Press], 1951, 46 pp., 25c.). MCCLINTOCK, H. F., *Old Irish*

& Highland Dress and That of the Isle of Man (2nd ed., enlarged, Dundalk, Dundalgan Press (W. Tempest) Ltd., 1950, xxii, 142, x, 87 pp.). McKEON, RICHARD and ROKKAN, STEIN, eds., *Democracy in a World of Tensions: A Symposium Prepared by UNESCO* (Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [Toronto, University of Toronto Press], 1951, xviii, 540 pp., $2.50). MAITLAND, FRANCIS HEREWARD, *Hussar of the Line* (London, Hurst & Blackett Ltd., 1951, 160 pp.). MAY, ARTHUR J., *The Hapsburg Monarchy, 1867-1914* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press [Toronto, S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited], 1951, xii, 532 pp., $8.00). MURRAY, JOHN J., ed., *Essays in Modern European History by Students of the Late Professor William Thomas Morgan* (Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1951, x, 150 pp., $2.25). *Navaho Means People;* photographs by LEONARD McCOMBE; text by EVON Z. VOGT and CLYDE KLUCKHOHN (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press [Toronto, S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited], 1951, vi, 159 pp., $6.75). NEVINS, ALLAN, *The New Deal and World Affairs: A Chronicle of International Affairs, 1933-1945* (The Chronicles of America Series, Allan Nevins, Editor, 56, New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1951, vi, 332 pp.). NORMAN, ALBERT, *Our German Policy: Propaganda and Culture* (New York, Vantage Press, 1951, iv, 85 pp., $2.50). Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, *A Pictorial History, 1851-1951* (Evanston, Chicago, Northwestern University Press, 1951, 198 pp.). PARKS, WALLACE JUDSON, *United States Administration of Its International Economic Affairs* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951, xxvi, 315 pp., $5.00). RAVINES, EUDOCIO, *The Yenan Way* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [Toronto, S. J. Reginald Saunders and Company Limited], 1951, vi, 319 pp., $4.00). RODABAUGH, JAMES H. and RODABRAUGH, MARY JANE, *Nursing in Ohio: A History* (Columbus, O., The Ohio State Nurses' Association, 1951, xiv, 273 pp.). SANSOM, G. B., *Japan in World History* (issued under the auspices of the Japan Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1951, viii, 94 pp.). *South Dakota Historical Collections and Report,* vol. XXV, 1950 (Compiled by the State Historical Society, Pierre, S.D., 1951, xii, 481 pp.). STRAWHORN, JOHN and BOYD, WILLIAM, eds., *Ayrshire* (The Third Statistical Account of Scotland, Edinburgh, London, Oliver and Boyd [Toronto, Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited], 1951, xviii, 885 pp., $5.25). United Kingdom, Central Statistical Office, *Statistical Digest of the War* (History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Civil Series, W. K. HANCOCK, Editor, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office and Longmans Green and Co. [Toronto, Longmans, Green & Co.], 1951, xii, 248 pp., $6.50). United States, Department of State, *Conference for the Conclusion and Signature of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, San Francisco, California, September 4-8, 1951: Record of Proceedings* (Department of State Publication 4392, International Organization and Conference Series II, Far Eastern 3, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, vi, 468 pp.); *The Conflict in Korea: Events Prior to the Attack on June 25, 1950* (Department of State Publication 4266, Far Eastern Series 45, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, iv, 36 pp., 15c.); *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945, from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry,* Series D (1937-1945), vol. IV: *The Aftermath of Munich, October 1938–March 1939* (Department of State Publication 3883, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, lxxxv, 733 pp., $2.75); *Foreign Relations of the United States Diplomatic Papers 1934* (in Five Volumes), vol. IV: *The American Republics* (Department of State

Publication 4089, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, lxvi, 640 pp., $2.75); *Fourth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, France, September 19–October 5, 1949: Report of the United States Delegation* (Department of State Publication 4249, International Organization and Conference Series IV, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization 14, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1951, iv, 55 pp., 25c.); *Guide to the U.N. in Korea: A Year of Collective Action* (Department of State Publication 4299, Far Eastern Series 47, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, 31 pp., 15c.); *In Quest of Peace and Security: Selected Documents on American Foreign Policy, 1941-1951* (Department of State Publication 4245, General Foreign Policy Series 53, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, vi, 120 pp., 55c.); *Point Four Pioneers: Reports from a New Frontier* (Department of State Publication 4279, Economic Cooperation Series 28, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, ii, 36 pp., 20c.); *Young Germany: Apprentice to Democracy* (Department of State Publication 4251, European and British Commonwealth Series 24, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, vi, 78 pp., 35c.); *Why Foreign Aid: Facts about the Mutual Security Program* (Department of State Publication 4301, General Foreign Policy Series 60, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, ii, 17 pp., 20c.). United States, Department of State, Division of International Conferences, *Participation of the United States Government in International Conferences, July 1, 1949–June 30, 1950, Including the Composition of United States Delegations and Summaries of the Proceedings* (Department of State Publication 4216, International Organization and Conference Series I, 14, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, xviii, 337 pp., 70c.). United States, Department of State, National Commission for UNESCO, *The United Nations and You* (Department of State Publication 4289, International Organization and Conference Series III, 70, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1951, ii, 50 pp., 30c.). WADDY, LAWRENCE, *Pax Romana and World Peace* (London, Chapman & Hall [Toronto, British Book Service (Canada) Ltd.], 1950, viii, xi (plates), 240 pp., $3.25). WILLIS, EDWARD F., *Herbert Hoover and the Russian Prisoners of World War I: A Study of Diplomacy and Relief, 1918-1919* (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1951, x, 67 pp.).

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA

PREPARED IN THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
BY MARGARET JEAN HOUSTON

Notice in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review. The following abbreviations are used: *B.R.H.–Bulletin des recherches historiques; C.H.R.–Canadian Historical Review; C.J.E.P.S.–Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science; R.H.A.F.–Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française.*

See also the quarterly bibliography published in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science,* and, in the *University of Toronto Quarterly,* "Letters in Canada," Part I, English-Canadian Letters, published each April, Part II, French- and New-Canadian Letters, published each July.

I. THE RELATIONS OF CANADA WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH

BIGGS-DAVISON, JOHN. The British Commonwealth and the French Union: A Constitutional Comparison (*National and English Review,* CXXXVIII (828), Feb., 1952, 96–100).

BROCK, W. R. *Britain and the Dominions.* British Commonwealth Series, I. Cambridge: At the University Press [Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited]. 1951. Pp. xxii, 522. $2.50. To be reviewed later.

GIPSON, LAWRENCE HENRY. *The British Empire in the Eighteenth Century: Its Strength and Its Weakness.* An inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 13 November 1951. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1952. Pp. 31. To be reviewed later.

HARVEY, HEATHER J. *Consultation and Co-operation in the Commonwealth: A Handbook on Methods and Practice.* Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. viii, 411. $6.50. To be reviewed later.

HASAN, K. SEWAR. *Pakistan and the Commonwealth.* Karachi: Pakistan Institute of International Affairs [New York: Institute of Pacific Relations]. 1950. Pp. 36. 75c. (paper).

LINKLATER, ERIC. *Our Men in Korea.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1952. Pp. 79. 65c. (paper), $1.25 (bound). "The first official account of the British Commonwealth troops' part in the Korean war." Obtainable from the United Kingdom Information Office, 275 Albert Street, Ottawa.

POLYZOIDES, A. TH. The British Commonwealth under Elizabeth II (*World Affairs Interpreter,* XXIII (1), spring, 1952. 60–71). An account of the recent development of the Commonwealth.

II. CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

AMERY, JULIAN. The Commonwealth and the Council of Europe (Strasbourg) (*United Empire,* XLIII (2), March–April, 1952, 76–81).

ANNIS, CLARE L. *The Dilemma of Air Power.* Montreal: The Canadian Club of Montreal. 1952. Pp. 16 (mimeo.). A plea for the writing of air force history in order to substantiate the author's views about the superiority of "air concept" (strategic bombing) over "ground concept" (normal military operations).

BRADY, ALEXANDER. Canadian-American Relations (*International Affairs*, XXVIII (2), April, 1952, 190–5).

GIBSON, JAMES A. Mr. Mackenzie King and Canadian Autonomy (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 12–21). ". . . some impressions of Mr. Mackenzie King's conduct of the external relations of Canada over the twenty-five year period during most of which he held the office of Secretary of State for External Affairs."

JESTER, PERRY N. Aspects of Canadian-American Relations (*Canadian Textile Journal*, LXIX (4), Feb. 15, 1952, 39–41).

KEENLEYSIDE, HUGH LL. and BROWN, GERALD S. *Canada and the United States: Some Aspects of Their Historical Relations*. Revised and enlarged edition; Introduction by W. P. M. KENNEDY. New York: Alfred A. Knopf [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, Limited]. 1952. Pp. xxvi, 406, xii. $6.50. To be reviewed later.

LAMBE, W. G. A. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (*Canadian Army Journal*, V (9), Dec., 1951, 5–14).

MCHENRY, DEAN E. The British Commonwealth and World Organization (*World Affairs Interpreter*, XXII (4), winter, 1952, 386–92). An analysis of some factors making for Commonwealth unity, and of Commonwealth participation in the United Nations.

MACKAY, R. A. and SAUNDERS, S. A. *The Modern World*. Revised edition. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1951. Pp. xii, 608. $5.00.

SYLVESTRE, GUY. Canada's First Legation (*Queen's Quarterly*, LIX (1), spring, 1952, 53–62).

United States, Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1943* (in five volumes). I. *General: The British Commonwealth.* Department of State Publication 4385. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office. 1951. Pp. xcvi, 1030. $3.75. Pages 845–994 deal with Canada.

WALTERS, F. P. *A History of the League of Nations*. Vols. I, II. Published under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. xvi, 1–464; viii, 465–833. $10.50. To be reviewed later.

III. HISTORY OF CANADA

(1) General History

BRUNET, MICHEL, FRÉGAULT, GUY et TRUDEL, MARCEL. *Histoire du Canada par les textes*. Montréal, Paris: Fides. 1952. Pp. 297. $3.50. To be reviewed later.

Canada, Department of Resources and Development, National Parks Branch, National Parks and Historic Sites Service. National Historic Parks and Sites, 1950-1951 (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 64–70).

Canadian Historical Association. *Report of the Annual Meeting Held at Montreal, June 6–8, 1951, with Historical Papers*. Edited by R. A. PRESTON, G. F. G. STANLEY, and L. LAMONTAGNE. Ottawa: The Association. 1952. Pp. 86. Papers are listed separately in this bibliography.

DUGRÉ, ALEXANDRE. *Notre Histoire en cinq actes*. Documents historiques no 21. Sudbury, Ont.: La Société historique du Nouvel-Ontario. 1951. Pp. 35. A brief study of the French in Canada.

FERGUSON, GEORGE V. Old and New Strides in Nationalism (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (22), March 8, 1952, 7, 17–18). A discussion of the development of Canadian nationalism since 1848.

GREENING, W. E. Canada's Historic Sites (*Queen's Quarterly*, LIX (1), spring, 1952, 26–31).

HOWARD, CLIFFORD S. *Canadian Banks and Bank-Notes: A Record.* Toronto: The author. 1951. Pp. 48, with 96 facsimiles. $2.00 (paper), $2.50 (bound). Reprinted from the *Canadian Banker,* winter, 1950, with the addition of facsimiles of old bank-notes.

HUTCHISON, BRUCE. *Winds of Chance.* Forward with Canada, no. 5. [Montreal: Northern Electric Co. 1951.] Pp. iv, 31, illus. Free. Short narratives of Canadian historical events.

OVERTON, R. C. *The Functions and Value of Corporation Histories.* Montreal: The Canadian Club of Montreal. 1952. Pp. 16 (mimeo.). A discussion of the contribution to be made to economic history by Canadian corporations in organizing their archives and arranging for the publication of their histories.

POTTER, G. R. L. The Coinage of Canada (*Canadian Banker,* LVIII (3), autumn, 1951, 22–45).

REEVE, G. J. and MACFARLANE, R. O. *The Canadian Pageant.* Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited. 1951. Pp. x, 433. $3.00.

REMINGTON, MARION V. *Our Friend and Neighbor, Canada.* Chicago: Lyons and Carnahan. [1951.] Pp. 213, illus.

RUMILLY, ROBERT. *Histoire du Canada.* Paris: La Clé d'Or [Montreal: Ducharme]. 1951. Pp. 592. $4.00. To be reviewed later.

STEVENSON, B. B. A Tale of Old Quebec (*Canadian Banker,* LVIII (3), autumn, 1951, 113–21). Notes on banking in Canada from the founding of the Quebec Bank in 1818 to Hincks's Resolutions on Banking and Currency in 1870.

(2) Discovery and Exploration

MACARTHUR, WILSON. *Traders North.* London, Glasgow, Toronto: Collins. 1951. Pp. 256. Fiction for boys, based on the first two expeditions by the Hudson's Bay Company to James Bay, in 1688 and 1670.

MYERS, HENRY. *The Utmost Island.* New York: Crown Publishers [Toronto: Ambassador Books]. 1951. Pp. 216. $3.75. A novel based on Icelandic explorations in the New World.

POHL, FREDERICK J. Land of the Smoking Hill (*Dalhousie Review,* XXXI (3), autumn, 1951, 152–66). The author marshals the evidence indicating that the Sinclair expedition described by Antonio Zeno reached Nova Scotia in 1398.

SMURR, JOHN W. A New La Vérendrye Theory (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly,* XLIII (1), Jan., 1952, 51–64). ". . . a fair study of such literature as is readily available to most scholars will support the idea of a Rocky Mountain discovery, with a subsequent return north of the Black Hills."

RAVARY, VIATEUR. Lahontan et la rivière Longue (*R.H.A.F.,* V (4), mars 1952, 471–92). A discussion of Lahontan's account of his discoveries.

SOLIS-COHEN, BERTHA. Philadelphia's Expeditions to Labrador (*Pennsylvania History,* XIX (2), April, 1952, 148–62). The account of two expeditions, 1753–4, organized by Benjamin Franklin, to explore the Arctic and search for a northwest passage.

(3) New France

DONNELLY, JOSEPH P., trans. Belmont's History of Canada (*Mid-America,* XXXIV, new series XXIII (2), April, 1952, 115–47).

FENWICK, KENNETH. *The Paths of Glory.* London: Hutchinson & Co. [Toronto: The Ryerson Press]. 1951. Pp. 384. $3.25. An historical novel, based on the life of General Wolfe.

KENT, DONALD H., ed. Contrecœur's Copy of George Washington's Journal for 1754 (*Pennsylvania History*, XIX (1), Jan., 1952, 1–32). The re-translation of a French copy of the journal, which fell into French hands at Fort Necessity in 1754.

LANCTOT, GUSTAVE. *Réalisations françaises de Cartier à Montcalm*. Montréal: Les Editions Chantecler. 1951. Pp. 212. $1.75.

LATOURELLE, RENÉ. *Etude sur les écrits de saint Jean de Brébeuf*. Vol. I. Préface de M. GUY FRÉGAULT. Studia Collegii Maximi Immaculatae Conceptionis, IX. Montréal: Les Editions de l'Immaculée-Conception. 1952. Pp. xx, 218. $3.00. To be reviewed later.

LE BER, JOSEPH. Tabellion de Dieppe (*R.H.A.F.*, V (2), sept. 1951, 265–76; V (3), déc. 1951, 426–8). Documents relating to immigrants leaving Dieppe for New France, 1657–65.

MASSÉ, PIERRE. Le Syndic de la colonie acadienne en Poitou (*R.H.A.F.*, V (1), juin 1951, 45–68; V (2), sept. 1951, 252–64; V (3), déc. 1951, 373–400).

PELL, ROBERT. Montcalm: The Ranger Cavalier (*Bulletin of the Fort Ticonderoga Museum*, LX (1), winter, 1952, 37–55). Some details of Montcalm's military exploits in Europe.

RASHED, ZENAB ESMAT. *The Peace of Paris, 1763*. With a Foreword by MARK A. THOMSON. Liverpool: At the University Press. 1951. Pp. xii, 270. 15*s*. To be reviewed later.

REID, ALLANA G. The Nature of Quebec Society during the French Régime (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 26–35).

ROBINSON, JAMES TROY. Fort Assumption: The First Recorded History of White Man's Activity on the Present Site of Memphis (*West Tennessee Historical Society Papers*, V, 1951, 62–78). Some account of the French on the Mississippi, 1673–1740, with particular account of Bienville's dealings with the Indians at Fort Assumption, 1735–40.

ROQUEBRUNE, ROBERT DE. Le Drame de Louisburg (*Amérique française*, III (1), janv.-fév. 1951, 9–12; III (2), mars-avril 1951, 48–59; III (3), mai-juin 1951, 9–17; III (4), juillet-août 1951, 42–8; III (5), sept.-oct. 1951, 29–32; III (6), nov.-déc. 1951, 36–40).

(4) British North America before 1867

ARMYTAGE, W. H. G. A Sheffielder Visits North America 1768–69 (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXI (4), winter, 1952, 304–10). An article based on a traveller's book, *A Voyage to North America Performed by G. Taylor of Sheffield in 1768 and 1769*.

BOISSONNAULT, CHARLES-MARIE. La Bataille de Saint-Eustache (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (6), fév. 1952, 425–41).

BOSSIN, HYE. In the Spirit of Abraham Lincoln: Canada and His Life and Times (*Canadian Film Weekly*, XVII (7), Feb. 13, 1952). Some notes on the Canadian attitude to the Civil War.

BOUSQUET, J.-GERARD. Jean-Baptiste Bousquet, le patriote (*B.R.H.*, LVII (4), oct.-nov.-déc. 1951, 217–21). An account of a participant in the Rebellion of 1837 who was deported.

BRAULT, LUCIEN. Recensement de Détroit en 1779 (*R.H.A.F.*, V (4), mars 1952, 581–5).

GARTH, THOMAS R. Archeological Excavations at Fort Walla Walla (*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, XLIII (1), Jan., 1952, 27–50). Recent excavations on the site of Fort Nez Percé, established on the Columbia River in 1818 by the North West Company, have revealed details of the fort and of its successor, Fort Walla Walla.

GROULX, LIONEL. Le Choix de la capitale au Canada (*R.H.A.F.*, V (4), mars 1952, 521–30).

LANCTOT, GUSTAVE. When Newfoundland Helped to Save Canada (*Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, XLV, 3e série, sect. I, 1951, 41–52). In the fall of 1775 Newfoundland sent volunteers to help Canada against the Americans.

LARTER, HARRY C., JR. German Troops with Burgoyne, 1776-1777 (*Bulletin of the Fort Ticonderoga Museum*, IX (1), winter, 1952, 13–24). Details of German units operating from Canada early in the Revolutionary War.

NUTE, GRACE LEE. Border Chieftain (*The Beaver*, outfit 282, March, 1952, 35–9). An account of the early career of Dr. John McLoughlin, the years 1803-24 when he was a fur trader in the Rainy River district.

ORR, MYRON DAVID. *The Citadel of the Lakes*. New York: Dodd Mead & Company [Toronto: Dodd Mead & Company (Canada) Limited]. 1952. Pp. 287. $3.50. A novel based on the struggle between the settlers at Mackinac and the Astor Fur Company at the time of the War of 1812.

OUELLET, FERNAND. Denis-Benjamin Viger et le problème de l'annexion (*B.R.H.*, LVII (4), oct.-nov.-déc. 1951, 195–205). Denis-Benjamin Viger, a cousin of Louis-Joseph Papineau, was an admirer of the American system, but was opposed to annexation in 1849.

YOUNG, GEORGE S. Two Bits of Biography (Calgary Associate Clinic, *Historical Bulletin*, XVI (4), Feb., 1952, 69–77). The first part of this article is concerned with Lord Durham.

(5) Canada since 1867

BARTLETT, JACK FORTUNE. *1st Battalion, The Highland Light Infantry of Canada, 1940-1945*. Galt, Ont.: Highland Light Infantry Association of Canada. [1951.] Pp. 136, with maps and illustrations. To be reviewed later.

BUCKLEY, CHRISTOPHER. *Norway, the Commandos, Dieppe*. The Second World War, 1939-1945, a Popular Military History, by various authors; in eight volumes. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1951. Pp. viii, 276. $2.40. Obtainable from the United Kingdom Information Office, 275 Albert Street, Ottawa. To be reviewed later.

Canada, Department of National Defence, Army Headquarters, Historical Section. The Conquest of Sicily (*Canadian Army Journal*, V (8), Nov., 1951, 5–17).

Court Historique des Fusiliers Mont-Royal; Short History of Les Fusiliers Mont-Royal (*Canadian Military Journal*, XVIII (9), Feb., 1952, 17–18; 30–1).

CROSS, AUSTIN F. Oligarchs at Ottawa (*Public Affairs*, XIV (1), autumn, 1951, 16–24; XIV (2), winter, 1952, 21–9). A series of articles on senior officials of the public service.

DEVON, STANLEY. *The Royal Canadian Tour*. London: Pitkin Pictorials Ltd. [Toronto: Ambassador Books]. Pp. 92. 1951. $1.75.

EGGLESTON, WILFRID. Recent Trends in Federal-Provincial Relations (*Canadian Banker*, LIX (1), winter, 1952, 66–78).

The First Canadian Parachute Battalion in Normandy (*Canadian Army Journal*, V (8), Nov., 1951, 30–43).

History of the Royal Canadian Armoured Corps (*Canadian Military Journal*, XVIII (8), Jan., 1952, 30–2).

JEWKES, V. W. Canadian Armour Fights in Korea (*Canadian Army Journal*, V (8), Nov., 1951, 20–9).

Knox, Olive. The Question of Louis Riel's Insanity (*Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Series III (6), 1951, 20–34).

Leland, Marine. Quelques Observations sur le nationalisme de Henri Bourassa (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 60–3).

Livingston, William S. The Amending Power of the Canadian Parliament (*American Political Science Review*, XLV (2), June, 1951, 437–49).

Lowe, Frank. The Canadian Island Nazis Tried to Grab (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (22), March 8, 1952, 8, 18–19). "How Anticosti Island almost provided our enemies with a base for attacks on Canada."

McConechy, Colin. The Last Non-Treaty Crees (*Canadiana*, III (4), winter, 1952, 7). In November, 1951 the Witchegan Crees of northern Saskatchewan acknowledged the ceding of their lands to the Canadian Government.

MacGibbon, D. A. *The Canadian Grain Trade, 1931-1951*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1952. Pp. x, 227. $4.50. To be reviewed later.

Mitchell, W. O. The Riddle of Louis Riel (*Maclean's*, LXV (3), Feb. 1, 1952, 7–9, 43, 45; LXV (4), Feb. 15, 1952, 12–13, 41–2, 44–5).

Randle, Martha Champion. The New Indian Act (*Canadian Forum*, XXXI (374), March, 1952, 272–4).

Ross, Richard M. *The History of the 1st Battalion, Cameron Highlanders of Ottawa (M.G.)*. With a Foreword by Colonel Cameron M. Edwards. Ottawa. n.d. Pp. viii, 96.

Rowat, D. C. Recent Developments in Canadian Federalism (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XVIII (1), Feb., 1952, 1–16).

The Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps (*Canadian Military Journal*, XVIII (8), Jan., 1952, 12–13; XVIII (9), Feb., 1952, 12–13).

The Royal Tour, Canada, 1951. Toronto: The Ryerson Press. 1952. Pp. 96, illus. $3.00.

Shea, Albert A., ed. *Culture in Canada: A Study of the Findings of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1949-1951)*. Toronto: Core. 1952. Pp. 65. $1.00. A brief account and some commentary on the main findings and recommendations of the Commission.

Some Dates in Canadian Naval History (*Crowsnest*, IV (5), March, 1952, 16–17). A summary of outstanding events in the Navy's history, 1905-39.

Stacey, C. P. Canadian Voyageurs in the Sudan, 1884-1885 (*Canadian Army Journal*, V (7), Oct., 1951, 61–73; V (8), Nov., 1951, 58–68; V (9), Dec., 1951, 16–26).

Williams, John R. Representation in the House of Commons of the Twenty-First Parliament: Party and Province (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XVIII (1), Feb., 1952, 77–87).

IV. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

(1) Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces

Bernard, Antoine. L'Acadie se souvient, 1752-1952 (*Relations*, XII (136), avril 1952, 92–5).

Corbett, E. A. A. B. MacDonald: The Paul Bunyan of Cooperation (*Food for Thought*, XII (5), Feb., 1952, 5–10). The work of one of the pioneers of the St. Francis Xavier co-operative movement.

Nova Scotia, Public Archives. *Report of the Board of Trustees for the Year 1950*. Halifax: King's Printer. 1951. Pp. 40.

(2) The Province of Quebec

Bruchési, Jean. Conférence: Fidélité française (Société Historique Franco-Américaine, *Bulletin, 1950*, 5–22).

BRUNET, MICHEL. Les Idées politiques de la *Gazette littéraire* de Montréal (1778-1779) (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 43–50).

Les Cahiers des Dix, no 16. Montréal: Les Dix. 1951. Pp. 283. To be reviewed later.

MAURAULT, OLIVIER. *The French of Canada and New England: A Newcomen Address in Vermont.* New York, Montreal: Newcomen Society in North America. 1950. Pp. 28, illus. 50c.

Nécessitiés nationales du Canada français: A propos du III^{e} Congrès de la Langue française (*Les Carnets Viatoriens*, XVII (2), avril 1952, 81–8).

PELLERIN, MAUDE GACE. *The Story of Hatley.* [Hatley, Que. 1951.] Pp. 84, illus. $1.00.

POTVIN, DAMASE. Nos Vieilles Maisons (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (8), avril 1952, 659–71).

RAYMOND, W. O. Philip Henry Gosse and *The Canadian Naturalist* (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, XLV, 3rd series, sect. II, 1951, 43–58). "Philip Gosse's brief stay in Compton was only an episode in his long life, but he has left us a valuable memorial of it in the first of his published books, *The Canadian Naturalist*, printed in 1840."

Société Historique Franco-Américaine. *Bulletin, 1950.* Manchester, N.H.: Ballard Frères. 1951. Pp. 134. Two articles from the *Bulletin* are listed separately in this bibliography.

THOMAS, R. B. and CLEGG, A. Ways about Quebec (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, XLIV (1), Jan., 1952, 22–37).

TRUDEL, MARCEL. *Le Régime militaire dans le gouvernement des Trois Rivières, 1760-1764.* Collection "L'Histoire régionale" no 8. Les Trois Rivières: Editions du Bien Public. 1952. Pp. xxxii, 236, avec cartes. $2.00. To be reviewed later.

(3) The Province of Ontario

AITKEN, HUGH G. J. The Family Compact and the Welland Canal (*C.J.E.P.S.*, XVIII (1), Feb., 1952, 63–76). An article concerned with "the role of government in the economic life of Upper Canada before 1840."

CHAPMAN, ETHEL. The Tweedsmuir History Books (*Food for Thought*, XII (7), April, 1952, 31–5). An account of the local histories compiled by the Ontario Women's Institutes.

EAMES, FRANK. *Gananoque Blockhouse, 1813–1859.* Gananoque: The *Reporter*. 1951. Pp. 14, illus.

FOX, WILLIAM SHERWOOD. Wreck of the Steamer *Simcoe* (*Inland Seas*, VIII (1), spring, 1952, 29–32). The account of a disaster of 1880 in Georgian Bay.

Innisfil Township. *A Record of 100 Years of Progress: Innisfil Township Centennial, 1850-1950.* [Barrie, Ont. 1951.] Pp. 184, illus. $1.25. Obtainable from Innisfil Township Office, Churchill, Ont.

TREMBLAY, RODOLPHE. *Timmins: Métropole de l'or.* Documents historiques no 22. Sudbury, Ont.: La Société historique du Nouvel-Ontario. 1951. Pp. 48.

(4) The Prairie Provinces

CAMPBELL, MURRAY. The Postal History of Red River, British North America (*Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Series III (6), 1951, 7–19).

JOHNSON, ROY P. The Fenian "Invasion" of 1871 (*Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, III (7), 1952, 30–9). Notes on a Manitoba-United States border disturbance.

LeBourdais, D. M. The "Herald" Went Too Far (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (20), Feb. 23, 1952, 10, 40). "Memories of an early oil boom in Calgary."

McFadden, Molly. Steamboating on the Red (*Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Series III (7), 1952, 21–9).

McNeill, Leishman. *Tales of the Old Town: Calgary 1875-1950*. Calgary: The *Herald*. [1951.] Pp. 92, illus. A collection of articles on Calgary's early days, written especially for the *Herald* in connection with Calgary's seventy-fifth anniversary celebrations.

Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba. Series III, nos. 6, 7. Edited by J. A. Jackson, Gordon W. Leckie, and W. L. Morton. Winnipeg: Advocate Printers Ltd. 1951; 1952. Pp. 56; 39. Papers are listed separately in this bibliography.

(5) The Province of British Columbia

Atkinson, Reginald N. Changes in Okanagan Place-names (Okanagan Historical Society, *Fifteenth Report, 1951*, 21–4).

Holbrook, Stewart H. *Far Corner*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited. 1952. Pp. 270. $4.75. An account of travels in the Pacific Northwest, including British Columbia.

Johnson, Kate. *Pioneer Days of Nakusp and Arrow Lakes: Nakusp Diamond Jubilee, 1892-1952*. Nakusp, B.C. 1951. Pp. vi, 146, illus. $2.75. Obtainable from the author, Box 22, Nakusp, B.C.

Okanagan Historical Society. *Fifteenth Report, 1951*. Edited by Margaret A. Ormsby. Vernon, B.C. 1951. Pp. 219. $2.50.

Ormsby, Margaret. A. L. Fortune's Autobiography (Okanagan Historical Society, *Fifteenth Report, 1951*, 25–40). The autobiography of the first settler in the Spallumcheen district of British Columbia.

Shaw, Charles Lugrin. Why BC's Coalition Split (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (19), Feb. 16, 1952, 11, 17).

V. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

Audet, Louis-Philippe. *Le Système scolaire de la province de Québec. II. L'Instruction publique de 1635 à 1800*. Québec: Les Presses Universitaires Laval. 1951. Pp. xxii, 362. To be reviewed later.

Barbeau, Victor. Savoir pour agir: La condition du français au Canada (*Les Carnets Viatoriens*, XVII (2), avril 1952, 104–8).

Creamer, L. History of Ottawa University Medical School (*Camsi Journal*, X (4), Dec., 1951, 33–4).

Décarie, Vianney. L'Enseignement de la philosophie dans nos collèges et nos universités (*Culture*, XIII (1), mars 1952, 56–62).

Fletcher, Robert. The Language Problem in Manitoba Schools (*Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Series III (6), 52–6).

The Humanities Research Council of Canada. *Third Report, 1949-1951*. Ottawa: The Council. [1952.] Pp. 48.

Josserand, L. L'Ecole primaire de langue française au Canada (*Education nationale*, janv. 1951, 5–7).

Lamarche, Gustave. *Le Collège sur la colline: Petit historique du Collège Bourget de Rigaud*. Orné de six dessins de maisons et de trois lettrines en couleurs par le P. Jean-René Goulet, C.S.V. Rigaud, Qué: Edition de l'Echo de Bourget. 1951. Pp. 197. $2.50.

LEBEL, MAURICE. La Faculté des lettres de Laval (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (6), fév. 1952, 449–64).

LORTIE, LÉON. The B.A. Degree in Our French-Speaking Universities (*Culture*, XIII (1), mars 1952, 21–30).

MAHEUX, ARTHUR. La Fête patronale de l'Université (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (7), mars 1952, 582–7).

MASTERS, D. C. Bishop's University and the Ecclesiastical Controversies of the Nineteenth Century (1845-1878) (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 36–42).

MORTON, W. L. Manitoba Schools and Canadian Nationality, 1890-1923 (Canadian Historical Association, *Report*, 1951, 51–9).

PLANTE, ALBERT. Les Ecoles séparées d'Ontario (*Relations*, XI (131), nov. 1951, 291–5; XI (132), déc. 1951, 330–4; XII (134) fév. 1952, 47–50; XII (135), mars 1952, 62–5).

RAVENHILL, ALICE. *The Memoirs of an Educational Pioneer*. With a Foreword by NORMAN MACKENZIE. Notes, bibliography, illustrations. Toronto, Vancouver: J. M. Dent and Sons (Canada), Limited. 1951. Pp. xii, 241.

Royal Military College of Canada Review: Log of H.M.S. Stone Frigate. Vol. XXXIII. Kingston: 1952. Pp. xxx, 194, xlv. $1.00.

STAMP, L. DUDLEY. *Geography in Canadian Universities, 1951: Report of a Survey under the Auspices of the Canadian Social Science Research Council*. Ottawa: Canadian Social Science Research Council. 1951. Pp. 75. 75c.

VI. RELIGIOUS HISTORY

ANDRÉ, MARIE. *La Magnifique Histoire de Notre-Dame de Puy*. Nicolet, Qué.: Centre Marial Canadien. [1951.] Pp. 33. 20c.

BERNARD, ANTOINE. *Les Clercs de Saint-Viateur au Canada. II. Le second Demi-siècle, 1897 à 1947*. Montréal: Clercs de Saint-Viateur. [1951.] Pp. 612. $3.00.

BRADLEY, W. H. The Diocese of Ottawa (*Canadian Churchman*, LXXIX (3), Feb. 7, 1952, 38-9).

The Diocese of Toronto (*Canadian Churchman*, LXXIX (9), May 1, 1952, 137–8).

DRAGON, ANTONIO. *Enseveli dans les neiges: Le Père Jules Jetté*. Montréal: Editions Bellarmin. 1951. Pp. 231.

FORBES, G. Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary in Early British Columbia History (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXII (1), janv.-mars 1952, 82–9). An account of early missions in British Columbia.

Le Laicat et les missions: Rapport de la Quatrième Semaine d'Etudes missionnaires tenue à Montréal, du 16 au 22 octobre 1950. Ottawa: Les Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa. 1951. Pp. 276.

MOLE, JOHN. The Story of Our Lady of the Cape (*Oblate Missions*, no. 26, April–June, 1952, 8–9, 27–9, 37). A history of the shrine at Cap de la Madeleine.

OUELLETTE, EDMOND. *Album-Souvenir: Eglise Saint-Urbain, Lamèque, N.-B.* Edmundston, N.-B.: April et Fortin Ltée. [1951.] Pp. 81.

PARÉ, GEORGE. *The Catholic Church in Detroit, 1701-1888*. Detroit: The Gabriel Richard Press. 1951. Pp. xvi, 717, illus. Over one-third of the book is devoted to the French period.

SHAVE, HARRY. Pioneer Protestant Ministers at Red River (*Papers Read before the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba*, Series III (6), 1951, 35–51).

THERIAULT, YVON. *L'Apostolat missionnaire en Mauricie*. Collection "L'Histoire regionale" no. 7. Les Trois Rivières: Editions du Bien Public. 1951. Pp. 144. $1.50.

VII. GENEALOGY

BAILLY, EDWARD-C. Genealogy of the Bailly de Messein Family in the United States (*B.R.H.*, LVI (7, 8, 9), juill.-août-sept. 1950, 180–95; LVII (1), janv.-fév.-mars 1951, 27–38; LVII (2), 77–100).

DENISON, RICHARD LONTON. *The Canadian Pioneer Denison Family of County York, England, and County York, Ontario: A History, Genealogy and Biography.* 2 vols. Toronto. 1951. Pp. 52 (mimeo.). $1.25 per vol. Obtainable from the author, 191 Dawlish Ave., Toronto.

LEFEBVRE, JEAN-JACQUES. Famille Sainte-Marie, de Laprairie (*B.R.H.*, LVII (4), oct.-nov.-déc. 1951, 179–84).

MASSÉ, PIERRE. Descendances acadiennes: Les quatres filles de Marie-Reine Berbudeau (*R.H.A.F.*, V (4), mars 1952, 531–41).

Urbain Jetté, 1627–1684, premier ancêtre canadien. Montréal: Thérin Frères Limitée. 1949. Pp. 35, illus. $1.00.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Canada, Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Geographical Branch. *Selected Bibliography of Canadian Geography with Imprint 1951.* Bibliographical Series no. 8, pt. 2. Ottawa. 1952. Pp. 21. Free.

——— *University Dissertations, Theses and Essays on Canadian Geography.* Bibliographical Series no. 3, addenda no. 1. Ottawa. 1951. Pp. 3 (mimeo.).

Canadian Library Association, Microfilm Committee. *Newspaper Microfilming Project Summary Catalogue, 1948–1951.* Ottawa: The Association. 1952. Pp. 11 (mimeo.). Obtainable from the Association, 46 Elgin St., Ottawa. Includes all titles listed in catalogues 1, 2, and 3.

ENO, ARTHUR L., comp. Documents acadiens tirés des Archives de l'Etat du Massachusetts (deuxième partie) (*Société Historique Franco-Américaine, Bulletin, 1950,* 72–118). For the first section, see *Bulletin* of the Société Historique Franco-Américaine, 1948-9, 58–78.

HAMILTON, ROBERT M., comp. *Canadian Quotations and Phrases, Literary and Historical.* With an Introduction by BRUCE HUTCHISON. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited. 1952. Pp. xiv, 272. To be reviewed later.

International Bibliography of Historical Sciences. XVIII. *1949, Including Some Publications of Previous Years.* Edited for the International Committee of Historical Sciences, Zurich, by JIRINA SZTACHOVA and ADOLF SZTACHO. Published with the assistance of UNESCO and under the patronage of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin. 1951. Pp. lii, 347.

MORIN, CONRAD. Eclaircissements inédits de Faillon sur son *Histoire de la colonie française* (*R.H.A.F.*, V (4), mars 1952, 585–8). Some of the correspondence carried on by Faillon in the course of research in connection with his history of New France (1865).

WHITFIELD, J. BELL, JR. Bibliography of the History of Medicine of the United States and Canada–1950 (*Bulletin of the History of Medicine,* XXV (5), Sept.-Oct., 1951, 464–89).

IX. ARTS AND SCIENCES

(1) Literature, Art, and Music

AYRE, ROBERT. Western Painting Comes to Montreal (*Canadian Art,* IX (2),

Christmas–New Year, 1951-2, 57-9). An account of an exhibition of the works of western Canadian painters.

BASTIEN, HERMAS. Emile Nelligan, poète génial (1879-1941) (*Qui?*, III (2), déc. 1951, 25-40).

BELL, ANDREW. Gordon MacNamara–an Eye of His Own (*Canadian Art*, IX (2), Christmas–New Year, 1951-2, 51-4).

BLAKELEY, PHYLLIS. Music in Nova Scotia, 1605-1867 (*Dalhousie Review*, XXXI (2), summer, 1951, 94-101; XXXI (3), autumn, 1951, 223-30).

CAMERON, DONALD. A Potential Canadian Salzburg (Canadian Library Association, *Bulletin*, VIII (4), Jan., 1952, 110-11). An account of the Banff School of Fine Arts.

CORBEIL, WILFRID. Les Arts plastiques au Canada français (*Culture*, XII (4), déc. 1951, 341-52).

DES ORMES, RENÉE. Laure Conan: Un bouquet de souvenirs (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (5), janv. 1952, 383-91). An article on Félicité Angers (Laure Conan), "la pionnière de nos femmes de lettres."

DESROCHERS, ALFRED. Nelligan a-t-il subi une influence anglaise? (*Carnets viatoriens*, XVI, juillet 1951, 187-98; oct. 1951, 300-7).

FORSTER, MICHAEL. Young French Painters in Montreal (*Canadian Art*, IX (2), Christmas–New Year, 1951-2, 60-5).

GOUR, ROMAIN. Guillaume Couture, compositeur (1851-1915) (*Qui?*, III (1), sept. 1951, 3-24).

The Grand Opera House: 1894-95 (*Western Ontario Historical Notes*, IX (3), Sept., 1951, 120-8). The programmes of the Grand Opera House in London, Ontario, reflect the cultural life of the city in 1894-5.

HANSEN, THOR. *Canadian Crafts in Industry*. [Toronto: British American Oil Co. Ltd. 1951.] Pp. 16, illus. Free. ". . . a pictorial record of the crafts and designs incorporated in the interior decoration scheme of the British American Oil Building, Toronto."

POUINARD, ALFRED. Le Folklore d'origine française au Canada et en Louisiane (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (3), nov. 1951, 220-7).

SANDWELL, B. K. 1951: Canada Joins the Human Race (*Saturday Night*, LXVII (9), Dec. 8, 1951, 31, 39). Notes on Canadian writing in 1951.

SYLVESTRE, GUY. Où en est notre littérature? (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXI (4), oct.-déc. 1951, 427-48). A survey of French-Canadian literature since 1948.

Ukrainian Canadian Committee. *Program of the First Ukrainian Display of Fine Arts in Winnipeg, September 7, 8, 9, 1951*. Winnipeg: The Committee. 1951. Pp. 18, illus. Text in Ukrainian and English.

(2) Science and Agriculture

ANDERSON, FANNIE. *Doctors under Three Flags*. Detroit: Wayne University Press. 1951. Pp. x, 185. A history of medicine in Detroit, 1701-1837.

Association canadienne-française pour l'Avancement des Sciences. *Annales de l'ACFAS*. XVII. *1949–50*. Montréal. 1951. Pp. 172. Obtainable from the Association, Université de Montréal.

MORTON, W. L. The Significance of Site in the Settlement of the American and Canadian Wests (*Agricultural History*, XXV (3), July, 1951, 97–104).

REDFORD, J. B. Some Pioneers in the Medical History of British Columbia (*Camsi Journal*, XI (7), Feb., 1952, 24–6).

SPENCE, GEORGE. Water for the Prairies (*Canadian Geographical Journal*, XLIV (2), Feb., 1952, 48–57).

STANLEY, G. D. Medical Pioneering in Alberta: Dr. Hugh Lang of Granton, a Family Physician on the Old Ontario Strand (Calgary Associate Clinic, *Historical Bulletin*, XVI (4), Feb., 1952, 82–7).

WILLIAMS, JOHN HARGREAVES HARLEY. *Between Life and Death*. London: Cape [Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co.]. 1951. Pp. 288. $3.25. Biographies of twelve pioneers in the world of medicine, including one of Sir Frederick Banting.

(3) Geography, Transportation, and Migration

ANGELL, SIR NORMAN. A Challenge to the Commonwealth; Migration and Commonwealth Defence (*Listener*, XLVI (1179), Oct. 4, 1951, 531-2; XLVI (1180), Oct. 11, 1951, 584-5). Two articles dealing with freedom of movement within the Commonwealth.

BOYD, HUGH. *Seaway of Destiny*. Behind the Headlines, XI (7). Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education, Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Dec., 1951. Pp. 17. 15c.

Canada, Department of Citizenship and Immigration. *Canada: Descriptive Atlas*. Ottawa: King's Printer. 1951. Pp. 104, with 13 maps. $1.00.

CURRIE, A. W. The St. Lawrence Waterway (*Queen's Quarterly*, LVIII (4), winter, 1951-2, 558-72).

CURRY, FREDERICK C. St. Lawrence Steamboat Days (*Inland Seas*, VII (4), winter, 1951, 264-71).

FARRELL, MARVIN W. *The Guelph Junction Railway, 1884-1950*. Guelph, Ont.: Guelph Junction Railway Co. 1951. Pp. iv, 25 (mimeo.).

KAYE-KYSILEVS'KYJ, V. J. *Slavic Groups in Canada*. Slavistica, Proceedings of the Institute of Slavistics of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, J. B. RUDNYC'KYJ, Editor-in-chief, no. 12. Winnipeg, Man.: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences. 1951. Pp. 32. 50c. Text in English.

POUINARD, ALFRED. Relation de voyage Canada-Louisiane (*Revue de l'Université Laval*, VI (4), déc. 1951, 301-9). A study of French-speaking inhabitants of Louisiana, many of whom are direct descendants of the Acadians.

REYNOLDS, C. E. Ontario's Northland Railway (*Board of Trade Journal*, XLI (12), Dec., 1951, 27-32).

ROBINSON, J. LEWIS. Changing the Arctic Maps (*The Beaver*, outfit 282, Dec., 1951, 8-9; March, 1952, 24-6).

X. ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

See the quarterly bibliography published in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

CANADIAN GRADUATE THESES IN THE HUMANITIES AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, 1921-1946

This work was undertaken in 1947 by a joint committee of the Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Canadian Social Science Research Council, and was published in 1951. Those forming the committee were Professor Maurice Lebel, Professor J.-C. Falardeau, Dr. R. E. Watters, and Dr. Kaye Lamb. A copy may be obtained from the Queen's Printer, Ottawa, for one dollar. The list of theses is divided into the main categories such as economics, history, literature, philosophy, political science, and sociology, and there are a number of helpful subdivisions as well. The main subdivisions for history, for instance, are Canadian, medieval, and modern. Within the various subdivisions theses are listed alphabetically by author under the universities and colleges where they were completed. In many instances there are brief statements of the subject-matter of the theses, and the name of the directing professor, although unfortunately some universities failed to provide such information. Clearly, this work provides an invaluable guide to the graduate work accomplished in Canadian universities and colleges in the twenty-five year period under survey. It is to be hoped that from time to time supplements may be published bringing it up to date.

AMERICAN NAME SOCIETY

In Detroit last December, a group of scholars met in a conference on onomastics and voted to organize the American Name Society for the purpose of promoting and encouraging the study of place names, personal names, and scientific and commercial nomenclature. The new society plans to publish a quarterly devoted to articles on names written by members.

Elsdon C. Smith was elected President. A meeting will be held in December, 1952, in Boston, to complete the organization.

Those in the academic field and others who are interested in the subject are cordially invited to become members. Dues (active member, $5.00) should be sent to Professor Erwin G. Gudde, Treasurer, American Name Society, University of California Press, Berkeley 4, California.

LOCAL HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Head-of-the-Lake Historical Society. Recent papers delivered before this society were "Early Ancaster History" by T. Roy Woodhouse and "From Horse Car to Trolley Coach, a History of the Hamilton Street Railway" by Mr. W. S. McCulloch.

La Société historique du Nouvel-Ontario, Collège du Sacré Cœur, Sudbury, Ontario. During the meetings in 1950-1 the following were among the papers presented: "Ecoles séparées bilingues" by Senator Raoul Hurtubise, "Marguerite Bourgeoys" by Rév. F. Emile Gervais, S.J., and "L'Acadie" by Rév. F.

Jean Archambault. This society has published a further group of documents relating to the French-speaking community in northern Ontario.

Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba. Two booklets have been published containing papers read before the society in the years 1949-51. Among the papers included are: "The Postal History of Red River, British North America" by Murray Campbell, "The Question of Louis Riel's Insanity," by Olive Knox, "Steamboating on the Red" by Molly McFadden, and "The Fenian 'Invasion' of 1871" by Roy P. Johnson.

Our Contributors

C. R. Fay, Reader Emeritus in Economic History, Cambridge University, and formerly Professor of Economics at the University of Toronto, is author of a number of books concerned with economic history, the latest of which are *The Palace of Industry, 1851* (1951), *Huskisson and His Age* (1951), and *Round about Industrial Britain, 1830–1860,* soon to appear.

W. S. MacNutt is Professor of History at the University of New Brunswick and has contributed several articles to the Canadian Historical Review.

D. C. Masters is Professor of History at Bishop's University. He is author of *The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854* (1937), *The Rise of Toronto* (1947), and *The Winnipeg General Strike* (1950).

Alice R. Stewart is Associate Professor of History at the University of Maine and is author of several recent articles in the Canadian Historical Review.